

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1397726

*THE SPIRIT
OF LIBERTY*

ETC.

A. THEODORE WIRGMAN, B.D., D.C.L.



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

ec. Sol. Hell.

THE
SPIRIT OF LIBERTY
*AND OTHER SERMONS
AND ADDRESSES.*

133
585
56

THE
SPIRIT OF LIBERTY
AND OTHER SERMONS
AND ADDRESSES.

BY

A. THEODORE WIRGMAN, B.D., D.C.L.,

Late Foundation Scholar of Magdalene College, Cambridge; Vice-Provost and Rector of S. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Author of "*The Prayer Book, with Historical Notes and Scripture Proofs,*" "*The Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes,*" "*The English Reformation and the Book of Common Prayer,*" "*The Sevenfold Gifts of the Spirit,*" "*The Church and the Civil Power,*" Etc.

London:
BEMROSE & SONS LTD., 23, OLD BAILEY;
AND DERBY.

—
1893.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PATRI . IN . DEO . REVERENDISSIMO
GEORGIO . HOWARD . WILKINSON . S.T.P.
SANCTI . ANDREÆ . EP.
HOC . QVANTVLVMCVNQVE . LIBELLVM
DEDICAT
FILIVS . IN . CHRISTO
AVCTOR.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE following sermons have been preached at various times and places, and there is very little unity of subject in them to please justification for gathering them together in one volume. Some of them have been published before, and the author has sometimes been asked for them in their original pamphlet form. To republish them in the form they have now taken seemed the best way of meeting the desire of the few who may have been moved to ask for them.

I desire to express my thanks to my nephew, Mr. Arthur Goodman, B.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, for his kindness in seeing this little volume through the press.

A. THEODORE WIRGMAN.

CONTENTS.

I.

THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY.

A SERMON PREACHED IN S. MARY'S COLLEGIATE CHURCH,
PORT ELIZABETH, ON WHITSUNDAY, 1892.

“Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”—
II. Cor. iii. 17 Page
I

II.

THE MISSION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION.

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS,
MARGARET STREET, LONDON, ON THE OCCASION OF THE
34th ANNIVERSARY OF THE E.C.U., JUNE 14th, 1893.

“Members one of another.”—*Eph. iv. 25* 12

III.

CHAMPIONS OF THE FAITH.

A SERMON PREACHED IN LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL ON THE
XXI. SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY, 1882, IN MEMORY OF ROBERT
GRAY, D.D., FIRST METROPOLITAN OF SOUTH AFRICA,
AND NATHANAEL JAMES MERRIMAN, D.D., THIRD BISHOP
OF GRAHAMSTOWN.

“Ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once
delivered to the saints.”—*S. Jude 3* 27

IV.

THE HOLY ORDERS OF THE CHURCH
CATHOLIC.

A SERMON PREACHED IN S. GEORGE'S CATHEDRAL, GRAHAMS-TOWN, AT THE ORDINATION OF PRIESTS, HOLDEN BY THE LORD BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE, ON TRINITY SUNDAY, 1886.

	<i>Page</i>
Prefatory Note	44
Ordination Sermon.—“What mean ye by this Service?— <i>Exod. xii. 26</i>	58

V.

THE LIBERTY OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

A SERMON PREACHED IN S. MARY'S, PORT ELIZABETH, ON THE THIRD SUNDAY AFTER THE EPIPHANY, 1877.

“Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.”— <i>Gal. v. 1.</i>	73
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

VI.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE BISHOP AND CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF GRAHAMSTOWN, IN SYNOD ASSEMBLED, AT GRAHAMSTOWN, IN JUNE, 1876	104
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

VII.

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION OF THE LAITY, IN THE BODY OF CHRIST.

A SERMON PREACHED IN SUBSTANCE IN S. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, AT EVENSONG, ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17th, 1893.

"Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation."—*I. Peter* ii. 9 123

VIII.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

A SERMON PREACHED IN THE UNIVERSITY CHURCH, CAM-
BRIDGE, ON OCTOBER 11th, 1893.

"That they all may be one: that the world may believe that
Thou hast sent Me."—*S. John xvii. 21* 137

IX.

THE MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH.

BEING A PAPER READ BEFORE THE BIRMINGHAM CHURCH
CONGRESS OF 1893 149

I.

THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY.

A Sermon preached in S. Mary's Collegiate Church, Port Elizabeth, on Whitsunday, 1892.

“Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”—II. COR. iii. 17.

THE ideas of liberty and slavery have for ages past stirred the heart of humanity. Every man worthy of the name feels that the very idea of slavery is abhorrent to him. Every true man longs to be free.

On Whitsunday we celebrate the great Festival of the Holy Spirit of God.

We think of the blessed freedom wrought by God the Holy Ghost, *the Lord and the Giver of Life*, —the only life worth living—the life dignified and crowned with *the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free*.

But to value true liberty we must first understand the meaning of slavery.

What is slavery?

It is the slavish subjection of matter and mind to base and disorderly uses. It is the direct work of the Arch-fiend himself. True freedom is to be found only in obedience to the highest law of our being, which is to exercise our freedom of will in a deliberate *choice*

of good and *refusal* of evil. It consists of our choosing deliberately to do the Will of God, and by so doing to fulfil our highest destiny by the act of our own free will. True freedom is to be found only in this loyal and free obedience which forms the sole law of our progress,—the sole law of our spiritual and moral evolution.

The transgression of this highest law of our being is sin. Sin is *lawlessness*, a foul and false parody of true liberty, which has been invented by the devil to mock and delude the souls of men. There is no true liberty to be found in the evil maxim of selfishness—“I shall do as I like; I shall please myself.” There is no true liberty in the disobedience and disorder begotten of self-pleasing, for the lawlessness of sin is slavery. The Spirit of Liberty is the Spirit of Order. True freedom lies in an ordered and orderly obedience to the Will of God.

I.—The coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost is the full manifestation of the Spirit of Liberty. But we must not forget that before the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit was in a lesser degree manifest in the world. The Spirit of God never left the world to itself, but was always present to guide the universe and order the nations.

“The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” of the primæval chaos—which was the confusion and disorder of the fair beauty and harmony

of the original creation—laid waste and ruined, as some of the Fathers of the Church have thought, by the fall of Satan and his hosts of evil spirits.

The Spirit of God is the Spirit of Order, and from the troubled waters of chaos He restored an ordered liberty into the physical universe, instead of the slavery of disordered wreck and confusion.

The restored creation of God was crowned by the creation of man in God's Image. We know not how God formed man's body from the dust of the earth. It may have been the result of a long process of evolution, or it may have been a single creative act. But we know certainly that the Spirit of God breathed upon him, and by that inspiring breath "Man became a living soul," whose destiny was to fulfil the fair ideal of God's Likeness in the perfectly ordered holiness of body, soul, and spirit. But man fell from his first estate, and, by the disobedience of his own free choice of evil, sin entered into the world. Satan enslaved the will of man, and then brought the slavery of disorder and moral ruin into the ordered freedom of God's finished work of creation.

But man was not to be condemned for ever to the slavery of lawlessness and sin.

The promise of the Incarnate Christ, the hope of a Mediator to come, was before all the men of the Old Testament period, who were consciously striving

after righteousness. God's Spirit of Liberty still strove with men of every nation and race, though they may not have known His gracious Presence.

Through the enfeebled light of the human conscience, struggling with the darkness and dim conceptions of the world's childhood, the Spirit of Liberty strove to free men from the chains of sin and lawlessness.

II.—But we trace His workings specially in the chosen people of God. Abraham, "the friend of God," as the Arabs still call him, the founder of a chosen family, destined to expand into a chosen tribe, a chosen people, a chosen nation, was guided by that Spirit of Liberty. So were Israel's faithful leaders in every age. The history of Israel, from the Exodus to the Captivity, bears witness to the guidance of the Spirit of Liberty. Their history is very human, marked as it is with national and individual sins. But David the King, in the midst of the profound penitence of the fifty-first Psalm, cries to the Spirit of Liberty to free him from the slavery of sin. "Establish me with Thy Free Spirit," is his prayer.

And the knowledge of God's Spirit increased as time went on.

Isaiah saw in his vision the Messiah dowered with the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost. The inspired prophets of Israel shared the prophetic

hopes of his vision, and longed for the Advent of the Redeemer King.

III.—In the fulness of time the vision was fulfilled. God was made man. For us men and for our salvation He was born at Bethlehem, and crucified at Calvary: For us men He rose again amidst the glories of the first Easter dawn. He ascended into heaven to throne our human nature in the Majesty of the God-head, and to win for us the full manifestation of the Spirit of Freedom. Ten days after the Ascension came the Feast of Pentecost, and the Holy Ghost came down from Heaven upon the waiting and expectant Church. The tongues of fire came down upon each of them. Each member of the Church had his special gift. “There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit.” And after Pentecost the Spirit of Liberty began to work upon the world with a fulness of power unknown before. The Spirit of Liberty moved upon the face of the waters—the troubled sea of political, social, moral, and spiritual chaos and disorder—as the restorer of order, harmony, and peace.

IV.—The Spirit of Liberty needed an instrument wherewith to manifest Himself to the world.

The Church of the Old Testament with its narrow limits had been broadened out by the Pentecostal outpouring until it had become the home of all nations—the visible and corporate society—known to men

as the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is the Body of Christ. And through this visible Society the Spirit of Liberty wrought upon the world.

Politically: the world was crushed under the iron heel of despotisms, such as the rule of Imperial Rome.

Socially: the world knew not any true brotherhood of humanity.

Morally: the world knew little else than the ethics of selfishness.

Spiritually: the world was sick unto death, wearied alike of philosophies that ended in Atheism, and Paganisms that were empty forms. Men were *tied and bound in the chain of their sins*, and were slaves *politically, socially, morally, and spiritually*.

The Spirit of Liberty came to change all this; not by a violent coercion or convulsion, which would destroy the freedom of the human will. Not by earthquake, tempest, or whirlwind, but by a *still small voice*, winning men to claim their freedom as the ransomed sons of God.

V.—It was thus that the Spirit of Liberty laid the true foundations of political freedom. All men had their rights as members of the Church Catholic. All were brethren in the unity of the Spirit and the body of peace.

The rights of men were gradually won by slow and sure stages. Little by little the work of the Spirit of Liberty has progressed, and is still progressing.

The still small voice of the Spirit appealing to the conscience and hearts of men has too often been unheeded and drowned amidst the convulsions and roaring of political tempests and earthquakes. Liberty has been confused with anarchy and lawlessness. The crimes of the Reign of Terror, the senseless excesses of the Paris Commune in the opening days of 1871, the mad deeds and foul murders wrought by the Nihilists and Anarchists of our own day are all of them sins against the true political freedom which is being wrought by the Spirit of God.

God claims every department of human life as His own. He knows of no arbitrary distinction between things religious and things secular. We cannot cut off and isolate any portion or department of human life and say, "This is secular; this does not belong to God at all."

Therefore, we believe that every true-hearted political leader, who is working for the sole good of his country; every honest and outspoken journalist; every ruler who lives only for his duty, and for the people whom he rules, is *inspired* by the Spirit of Liberty. As the organ of the Spirit of Liberty, it is the duty of the Church of God to heal the nations and touch by her influence every department of national life. It is too true that portions of the Church from time to time have been false to this ideal. There are tares in the wheat.

I do not forget the Spanish Inquisition, or the persecution of Anglicans by Queen Mary and of Roman Catholics by Queen Elizabeth, or the intolerance of the Puritans of the Commonwealth, or the political narrowness of Anglicans at the Restoration.

But, granting all this, we cannot forget the other side of the picture.

Take the darkest period of Church history when the mediæval Papacy was at its height. We cannot help seeing that great Popes like Hildebrand and Innocent III. defended the poor and oppressed from the tyrannies of feudalism, and stood forth as the champions of justice and right against the despotism of kings and princes. Take the whole history of Christendom, and judge it fairly. You will see that the Spirit of Liberty through its manifold workings has, through the Church, championed the poor and oppressed, emancipated women, and throned them with men as *heirs together of the grace of life*. It has urged unceasing war against slavery by methods gradual, rather than revolutionary. It has mediated between labour and capital. In our own days, it touched the soul of Lord Shaftesbury in his noble efforts on behalf of suffering populations, and English Churchmen are justly proud of the action of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, when in the House of Lords a few years ago the question of giving votes to agricultural labourers was so fiercely

debated. The Spirit of Liberty inspired the Archbishop when he told the House of Lords "to trust the people," and grant them their just political privileges.

VI.—And further, we may trust our manifold and complex *social* problems to the Spirit of Liberty. He will solve them for us, if we will listen to His still small voice. We need the true freedom of brotherhood instead of anarchy.

We are knit by the Spirit as many members into One Body—the Church, and true Christian Socialism is to remember that *we are members one of another*. The Stoics of old imaged forth a world brotherhood, a city of universal citizenship. But it was cold theory only. The Stoic ideal was as lifeless as some fair Greek statue.

But the Spirit of Pentecost breathed into it the breath of life, and S. Paul realised from the Stoic ideal the living citizenship and membership of the Church of the Living God. The work of the Holy Ghost will gradually enlighten the human conscience, and emancipate it from the slavery of self-interest.

It will broaden the narrow slavish trammels of a "business conscience" into the broad liberty of "a conscience void of offence towards God and man." Thus, and thus only, will the "classes and masses" be joined in true brotherhood. Thus, and thus only, can our social problems be solved.

VII.—And what of our moral and spiritual slavery to sin and disorder ?

The Spirit of Liberty will strike off our chains. The seat of sin and its slavery of lawless disorder is in the human will. The freedom of the will has been led captive by our habitual choice of evil. We are the slaves of evil habits. Christ died to set us free. He pours on us the freedom of the Spirit. Whilst we were the slaves of sin, *we were free from righteousness*. What a foul parody of freedom ! But now, being no more the servants of sin, we have *our fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life*.

What fruit had ye then in those things, whereof ye are now ashamed ? asked the Apostle. Were the chains of your slavery *really* sweet and pleasant to you ?

We know they were not. We know that they were as Dead Sea fruit, apples of Sodom, fair to see, but turned to ashes as they touch our lips. If there is one here to-night who is a slave to lawlessness, who is tied and bound in the chain of some evil habit, some root sin which penetrates the whole being, and influences the whole life, let the thought of the Blessed Spirit of Freedom encourage him to make a resolute effort to break the chain of his slavery.

Be a man—and not a slave. The Perfect Man did not knit you to Himself by the ties of a common humanity that you might still be a slave.

His Incarnate Love is the one unchangeable element in this world of change. Quit you like men. Be free. It may be hard at first. You may have worn your chains so long as to have got *used* to them.

The Spirit of the Lord is upon us all. In the grace of our Baptismal engrafting upon the Incarnate Life of our Lord, in the sevenfold gifts of Confirmation, in our Eucharistic Union with our Ascended Priest and King, the Holy Ghost is with us. *Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty*,—liberty won by gradual and toilsome steps—liberty won by slowly unwinding the chains of our old sins, little by little, from their cramping, fettering hold upon our hearts,—but liberty for all that;—liberty worth winning, worth struggling for—the glorious liberty of the children of God.

II.

THE MISSION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION.

A Sermon preached in the Church of All Saints, Margaret Street, London, on the occasion of the 34th Anniversary of the E.C.U., June 14th, 1893.

“Members one of another.”—EPH. iv. 25.

IN endeavouring to discharge the duty laid upon me this day (in the unavoidable absence of the Most Reverend the Metropolitan of South Africa), I am conscious of a great privilege and a great responsibility.

I regard the invitation to address my fellow-members of the English Church Union as a great privilege, because I feel that I have been asked to supply the place of our Metropolitan as a further token of your sympathy with the South African Church.

I am conscious that it is a great responsibility, because a man who has made his home out of England for nearly twenty years must necessarily be out of touch with the political, social, and ecclesiastical problems of the England of to-day.

But it is just possible that this very want of know-

ledge of detail—this very isolation in a distant portion of the Empire—may enable me to lay before you the independent impressions of a deeply-interested observer, and that I may be guided to say something out of the depths of my ignorance that may be suggestive in stirring wiser and abler minds to fruitful action.

“Members one of another.” The very words suggest a fit motto for a Union such as ours. Our special object is to defend and maintain the unity and historical continuity of the faith, discipline, and worship of the Catholic Church of Christ. There is room for our existence and need for our work as a great guild of Bishops, Clergy, and laity, banded together to set forth this unity. We can do the work which God has called us to do without narrowing in the least degree the broad and wide Catholicity which knits together the members of Christ as “members one of another.”

“Members one of another.” The words recall to me a memorable scene in S. Paul’s Cathedral more than twenty years ago. The late Archbishop of Canterbury chose them for the text of that most touching address which he delivered on the occasion of the National Thanksgiving for the recovery of the Prince of Wales. The service of that day was a real and heartfelt recognition of a national mercy, and was a national acknowledgment of God, more

complete in its way than we could have expected when we consider the general attitude of modern civil Governments towards religion. But what was this service ? It consisted solely of prayers and thanksgivings, glorious music and hymnody, and an address by the Archbishop. In its reverence and order it witnessed to the influence of the Catholic revival ; but it fell terribly short of the true Catholic ideal of worship and thanksgiving, which is centred in the Holy Eucharist.

I was in S. Paul's Cathedral a few weeks ago. The Archbishop and Bishops of England and the Convocations of Canterbury and York met together officially for the first time since the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The churchwardens of England were present by representation. The vast space of the Cathedral was filled with reverent worshippers, for the Primate of all England stood before the Altar of God to offer the Memorial Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, as the central act of Christian worship. There was no sermon or address. There was nothing to break the majestic unity of our Communion Office, rendered as it was with an august solemnity, derived from the special associations of the place, and from the unique occasion. The beauty of the music rendered by the choir, the voice of the great multitude in their hymnody of Eucharistic devotion, the reverent dignity of the celebrant, the hushed

thousands worshipping before the Altar of God, will cause the remembrance of that service never to fade from the memories of those who were present.

Such a service, on such an occasion, would have been impossible five-and-twenty years ago. It will mark an epoch in the history of the restored worship of the Church of England, and its effects will be felt, as helpful to reverence, throughout the Anglican Communion. To you who live in England, this service may not seem so significant as it does to me. The Spirit of God has been working in the Church of England so gradually that it may be difficult for the present generation to realise what God hath wrought for us in the past.

May I be permitted, as an outside observer of the work of the Church in England, to trace briefly the progress of God's working amongst us, as far as I have been able to understand it?

The first phase of the Church revival of 1833 restored our half-forgotten heritage of Primitive and Catholic doctrine.

The next phase gradually won back for us the expression of Catholic doctrine in Catholic worship and practice.

No victories have been won without losses. Our old men can remember the dark days of the early forties; the condemnation of Tract XC.; the shock of secessions; the distrusts and suspicions which

culminated in the days of the Gorham Judgment and the Papal Aggression.

The period of thirty-four years since the English Church Union was founded has been a time of storm and stress. Faithful men have been called "anarchists and bad citizens" for resisting the unjust oppression of a shameless and unveiled Erastianism. But, notwithstanding the bitterness of our foes, and our own occasional mistakes in defending the verities of Catholic belief and the dignity of Catholic worship, God has been with us of a truth.

Every Churchman must recognise that the English Church Union has been a most powerful factor in the restored Catholic life of the Church of England. It has been a defensive society throughout. It has never attacked, or even specifically protested against, the defective ceremonial of our Evangelical brethren, even when the laity have manifestly suffered through the deprivation of their lawful heritage of worship. It has been content to witness and work patiently for Catholic truth and Apostolic order in the full consciousness that "God fulfils Himself in many ways," and in the knowledge that loyal and true-hearted Broad Churchmen and Evangelicals have their special function to fulfil within the Catholic Church even as we have, and that it is our privilege to unite with them as brethren and as "members one of another."

The English Church Union has never been aggressive. It has been forced to repel attack.

A small but well-organised party of aggression has permitted its conscientious prejudices to overshadow its loyalty, and for the past forty years has from time to time appealed to the worst passions of popular Protestantism in its struggle to narrow the bounds of the Church of England and reduce it to the level of a Protestant sect. The resources of the State were laid under contribution. The House of Commons was invited to "put down Ritualism" by a cynical statesman who discovered that he could utilise the unlovely fanaticism of Orange Protestantism. A Bill was passed, which, under the pretext of regulating public worship, was meant to destroy the spiritual liberties of the Church and to efface the ancient canonical jurisdiction of the Bishops of England. Faithful priests were imprisoned as confessors for the spiritual liberties secured to the Church of England by Magna Charta, and confirmed by the Reformation Settlement. The English Church Union took its stand upon the noble words of Magna Charta : "That the Church of England should be free, and maintain its laws intact and its liberties uninjured."

The patient firmness and Christian heroism of the imprisoned priests taught Englishmen that the Church of the Living God was not the bond-slave of the State.

Their confessorship of loyalty to the King of Kings marked the first stage of our victory.

The next stage was reached when the canonical jurisdiction of the Bishops was partially restored by the vindication of the Episcopal veto, first by Bishop Mackarness of Oxford, and afterwards by the strength and firmness of the Bishop of London in dealing with the iconoclastic attack upon the reredos of St. Paul's Cathedral.

The last stage has been won through the sweet and gracious dignity of the Bishop of Lincoln and the statesmanlike courage of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in grasping the difficulties of the position, and daring, with a boldness such as no Primate has shown since the days of Laud, to do justice and judgment before God and the eyes of men without fear of consequences or considerations of expediency.

The Church of America and the daughter Churches of the Colonies have watched the progress of this great struggle with the keenest interest and sympathy. The American and Colonial Churches are happily free from the perplexities and embarrassments which necessarily environ an Established Church. But the echoes of your conflict with the world-power have reached us, and, in some cases, we have been partially involved in its issues. We belong to you. We are members one of another.

In 1870 the South African Church boldly pro-

claimed in its Constitution and Canons the spiritual independence of its Ecclesiastical Courts. It declared that all cases must be decided on their merits, and that the so-called ecclesiastical decisions of the Privy Council were of no authority in our Courts. We suffered for our boldness, we were in peril amongst weak brethren who desired to alter our Constitution, but the memory of Robert Gray, our first Metropolitan, lived in the firm lines of the policy we had inherited from him, and we held our ground.

We have seen peace in Grahamstown, and we have now the brightest hopes of peace in Natal. I know that we shall remember the Bishop-elect in our prayers, and especially on his consecration day.

But South African Churchmen did not hold their ground unaided.

We can never forget how promptly we received counsel and help from the English Church Union, and, as a South African priest, I know that I am but expressing the feelings of our Metropolitan, and the Bishops, Clergy, and laity of the Province in thus publicly acknowledging that generous gift of £500 to the fund for providing the Metropolitan with a coadjutor, which is the last token of sympathy we have received from you.

If you could realise, as I can, although I am not in his Diocese, the absolute necessity of immediately lightening the labours of our Metropolitan, in order

to avoid the calamity of his resignation; if you knew, as we know, with what gifts of statesmanship and spiritual power he has for nineteen years borne the heavy burden of the crozier of Robert Gray, and bravely occupied the most thorny and perilous Metropolitical throne in the Anglican Communion, you would understand our gratitude. I could say more. I could tell you of his bold public utterances in defence of the faith, such as his recent pastoral upon the Christian law of marriage. But as he is amongst the greatest of living Anglican prelates in his work and office, so is he numbered amongst the most modest and unassuming of men. I dare not say more, lest I could cause him pain.

And then there is your other gift to the Universities' Mission, which is a daughter of the South African Church. We never forget that the martyr Bishop Mackenzie was consecrated in Capetown Cathedral by the bold initiative of our late Metropolitan, whilst English lawyers were piling Pelion upon Ossa in the shape of mountainous legal difficulties in the way of consecrating a missionary Bishop.

The Diocese of Nyasaland, which your gift has strengthened, completes the chain of contiguous English Dioceses from Capetown to Uganda. The English Church Union has thus helped to knit together the Mother Church with her daughter

Churches, as "members one of another," in the solidarity of the Anglican Communion.

But the mission of the English Church Union does not end here. We can listen to no voices which tell us to disband our forces now that peace has followed our defensive struggle. The manifold activities of our Annual Report shew plainly that we have a further mission.

We are a great guild for teaching and educating the people of England in the true principles of the faith, discipline, and worship of the Catholic Church of Christ.

We must never rest until we have taught the people of England to restore to the Church the lawful spiritual liberties of her Ecclesiastical Courts. Churchmen in the Colonies and in America are keenly watching the Church of England just now. They are aware that the last decision of the Privy Council has eased the strained relations between the Church of England and the usurped authority of the State. I feel sure that any postponement of this vital question will not only injure the Church of England, but will tend to disintegrate the whole Anglican Communion. We shall never realise the full strength and blessing of corporate unity until the daughter Churches are able to unite with the Mother Church under the authority of one central and supreme spiritual Tribunal of Appeal. Temporary

expedients, such as the Councils of Reference, adopted by the Churches of Australia and the West Indies, are inherently unsatisfactory. They only manifest divergencies of method, and tend to hinder the corporate life of the Mother Church and her daughters as "members one of another."

It is almost unnecessary to say that the daughter Churches could never submit to a Court of Appeal that was not spiritual and free from the least taint of Erastianism. The establishment of such a Court is a vital necessity, and it cannot be done until the Church of England wins the ideal freedom set forth in the words of *Magna Charta*, and that freedom cannot be won by heroic remedies or fierce agitation. The people of England have to be taught to demand the restoration of the lost liberties of the Church, and the English Church Union can do this work by bold, patient, and continuous teaching.

There is another matter which seems to me to demand the exercise of our corporate teaching powers. The Bishop of Durham has very truly said that "we are suffering on all sides from a tyrannical individualism." We must teach people to deliver the Church from *ecclesiastical individualism*. The progress of the Catholic revival has been too often hindered and checked by selfish and thoughtless individual action. We must continue to discourage and repress the individualism that runs riot in a fancy ritual of

its own devising, until loyalty to the Prayer Book is forgotten and the souls of wise men are vexed.

I have been told that a few very unwise persons have been attempting to revive amongst us the observance of the Festival of the Assumption of the B.V.M. It is founded upon a baseless legend, and its observance is not compatible with loyalty to our Book of Common Prayer. I have also heard of a Church where the Epistle and Gospel of the Roman use were deliberately substituted for the Epistle and Gospel provided in the Prayer Book. There is no excuse for *avouia* of this kind, which only causes our enemies to blaspheme.

A mischievous individualism seems also to be manifested in the undue multiplication of societies and organisations for the furtherance of one common object. I am told that there are far too many societies for dealing with the poverty of the Clergy and the augmentation of clerical incomes. Surely we might set ourselves to teach Church people to unite all efforts and form one strong society.

And now I touch a point where personal knowledge avails me. The missionary work of the Church has been hindered by individualism. We ought to set a true ideal of missionary methods before Church people. The true ideal is, without doubt, a Board of Missions to represent the whole Church of England,

instead of societies that too often appear to compete with one another.

But if this is but a vision at present (and it ought not to be so), at all events let us teach people to avoid the undue multiplication of Diocesan Missions and agencies. It is surely possible to avoid past blunders and make a fresh departure. There is a good side to these special funds, if they bring definite interest to bear upon definite points in the Mission field, and they could surely be administered by one central agency to avoid friction and waste. But we cannot forget that the perpetual pressing of these competing Diocesan Missions is doing harm in the Colonies as well as in England. They minister to a kind of "diocesan congregationalism," which is rapidly becoming a danger. Then, again, there is the question of Church defence. We must teach people to defend the Church without incurring the grave danger of identifying it with one political party. We must get people to defend the Church from pure motives. Since I have been in England I have heard of people defending the Church Establishment, because they were jealous of the power which the Disestablished Church would possess.

We must set Church *reform* side by side with Church *defence*. We want no such schemes as Mr. Albert Grey once put forth, but we *do* want a reform which will restore their legitimate rights to our laity.

The Clergy should elect their Bishops, and the laity should exercise their ancient right of assenting to the election. We must not rest until we have reformed the present anomalous method of appointing Bishops in England.

The laity can claim also their due position in the Synods of the Church.

The Houses of Laymen of Canterbury and York, and the presence of the laity in diocesan Conferences, show a beginning of better things. But we must not be content until the laity can exercise their ancient canonical rights. We must also remove the blots on the administration of Church Patronage and give the Communicant laity an opportunity of carrying out the ancient canonical maxim, which is expressed in the words "*Nemo detur invitis.*"

We are face to face with the struggle for religious education. We have seen deputations of Churchmen, with hopelessly conflicting views, approaching the London School Board. Can we not, as a Union, help the Church of England to formulate one definite and well-considered educational policy, in which all can unite?

Our Roman Catholic brethren have a policy, and know what they want. We must find out exactly how much we can practically and successfully demand, and we must remember the power of well-considered corporate action. We have taken the question up, and with the help of God we shall carry it through.

And then there are the pressing social problems of the day. We have heard of an “ideal fellowship which shall strike the imagination, and which shall teach the power of social relationships and social obligations.” I venture to think that the English Church Union could educate public opinion on these matters also, and fulfil this ideal as well as any fresh organisation. Why should we not be banded together as “brethren and sisters of the common hope” with our past career of patient contention for the faith as a background for future effort? Why should we not take a leading part in winning the new democracy to the Catholic Faith, and initiate a new movement, springing out of the great Catholic revival, as its legitimate outcome and consequence, to bring the Church in closer touch with the masses than she has ever yet been?

The Church of England has an unique historical position as the Mother Church of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Let us free her, let us reform her on Catholic lines, let us redeem her from party spirit and individualism, let us open her doors to the people and compel them to come in.

God may then widen her sphere ; she may become not only the spiritual home of the Anglo-Saxon race—the missionary Church to other races—but the centre of unity, the pivot and rallying point of a reunited Christendom.

III.

CHAMPIONS OF THE FAITH.

A Sermon preached in Lichfield Cathedral on the XXI. Sunday after Trinity, 1882, in memory of Robert Gray, D.D., first Metropolitan of South Africa, and Nathanael James Merriman, D.D., third Bishop of Grahamstown.

“Ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.”—S. JUDE 3.

“THE faith which was once delivered to the saints,”—the members of Christ, the children of God, the inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven,—what is it? It is the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, God’s message of glad tidings to a fallen world, a message of pardon, mercy, and peace.

It is the Faith of the Catholic Church in her Incarnate Lord, our corporate faith, our individual faith in Jesus of Nazareth, our Immanuel—God with us.

It is the Faith whereby we overcome the world, the Faith whereby God’s heroes—the faithful soldiers and champions of the Cross—“subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped

the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, and turned to fight the armies of the aliens" (Heb. xi. 33, 34). It is the Faith of which Jesus is the Author and Finisher, enshrined alike in the Creeds of Christendom, and in the hearts and lives of individual Christians. It is the Faith of the Old Covenant in a Redeemer to come, shining forth in exceeding radiancy of glory in the Faith of the New Covenant that the Redeemer *has* come, and that "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads" (Isa. xxxv. 10).

It is the realisation of Jacob's vision at Bethel. The chasm between earth and heaven, formed by man's disobedience, has been for ever bridged over by the Incarnation. *God* has unveiled Himself to *men*, and has delivered to us as the *central fact* of the history of our world that "a Man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest" (Isa. xxxii. 2), even the Man Christ Jesus.

It is the only hope of fallen, sin-stricken humanity ; the only solution of the vexed problems which beset human existence ; the only means whereby our emptiness of soul can be filled with all the fulness of God.

Therefore, my brethren, we can understand why

S. Jude bids us “earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.”

Men may tell us that it is difficult to realise the power of the Faith in this cold nineteenth century of ours. It may be so in the case of persons who have allowed their spiritual perceptions to be deadened by chill blasts of narrow-hearted scepticism. It may be so with those tempted to waver before the unscrupulous onslaughts of a criticism whose intolerance overshadows its ignorance, and whose leaders assail revealed religion in the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, whilst professing to pose as defenders of fairness and freedom of thought.

And, whilst those who can best judge of the spirit of the age have abundant grounds to thank God, and take courage, it is well for us to ponder the past triumphs of our Faith, and to compare our past with our present. History repeats itself, and it is good for us to know our Church history.

The beacon lights of the champions of our Faith—the glorious company of the Apostles, the noble army of Martyrs, Confessors, and Doctors of the Church—should illumine our path heavenward, and draw us closer to the Light whence they derive their radiance—even Christ, the one true Light of the world.

And lest the distance between our age and theirs

drive us in any measure from reality to ideal, it is good for us to see how

“Age by age and year by year
His grace is handed on,
And still His holy Church is here
Although her Lord is gone.”

Each century of Church history shews its own muster-roll of the warriors, leaders, and teachers of Christendom. The Power from on high that gave courage to the proto-martyr S. Stephen, and to the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, shone forth just as brightly in the martyr-deaths of S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp, and the glorious band who counted not their lives dear unto them during the first ages of persecution.

The whole machinery of the Roman State, the firm grip of the secular law-courts, the passionate outcry that these Christians were law-breakers and bad citizens, the manifold and subtile inner devices of the Evil One, were urged in vain against the Ark of God.

In A.D. 313 the Edict of Milan won toleration for the Faith of Christ. A Christian sat on the throne of the Cæsars, and the despised emblem of the crucified Nazarene displaced the proud eagles of Imperial Rome.

The age of perils amongst false brethren was come. The bitter struggle to preserve the Faith of Nicæa against Arian subtleties produced S. Athanasius.

Athanasius contra mundum is a pregnant phrase when we consider that the world-power became Arian, and that Catholics had to suffer the loss of their Church buildings at the hands of the secular power, when Arian Bishops and Clergy were forced into Churches built by believers in our Saviour's Godhead. But the Church knew the power of her Master's promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Century by century the battle of the Faith was won and the truth prevailed.

The Church Catholic in England can unfold a grand muster-roll of martyrs, confessors, and saints. This noble Minster is more to us than an architectural glory of our Church, glorious though it be in its dignified symmetry and stateliness of beauty. The Cathedrals of England link for us the memories of a glorious past with a fruitful present, and nowhere is this lesson more clearly graven out for us than on the West Front of Lichfield Cathedral. There, indeed, is a sermon in stone for a thoughtful English Churchman. S. Chad, the single-hearted, humble, and earnest Apostle of Mercia; Bishop Hacket, the restorer of this Cathedral after its ruin by an impious Puritanism, which "brake down all the carved work thereof with axes and hammers;" Bishop Lonsdale, the wise and gentle scholar; Bishop Selwyn, the bold and intrepid soldier of the Cross, given to the nineteenth century as a mission-

ary Bishop with the zeal of S. Chad ; the organising forethought of Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus ; and the Apostolic fervour of that prince of missionary Bishops, the Apostle Paul himself—these all in sculptured dignity look down upon us, to teach us that God has His champions of the Faith in every age, and that the power of the Holy Ghost nerves men to do and dare all for Christ in this nineteenth century of ours, just as they did in the early days of primitive faith and zeal.

As a South African priest, I feel it my privilege and my duty to remind English Churchmen of the founding and progress of the Church in South Africa.

It is the story of a bitter struggle against heresy and the world-power. It is a story of victory through seeming defeat, gain through seeming loss, spiritual triumph won through simple unfailing trust in the Lord and in the power of His might.

The whole history of the Colonial Church is a mighty witness to the truth and office of our Mother Church of England, but South African Churchmen can fairly claim that their Province became a centre of action and a battlefield of the Faith, whence others reaped spiritual strength, and that Robert Gray, the first Metropolitan of South Africa, won a battle against heresy and Erastianism, whose issues were felt throughout the length and breadth of Anglican Christendom.

About forty years ago the few scattered congregations of the English Church in South Africa were under the nominal episcopal charge of the Bishop of Calcutta, who, I need hardly say, was unable to care for them as their Bishop. Some of them began to weary of Congregationalism, and to long for better things. In 1845 the vestry of my own parish, S. Mary's, Port Elizabeth, petitioned the authorities to procure the appointment of a Bishop for South Africa ; and on S. Peter's Day, 1847, Robert Gray was consecrated the first Bishop of a See which then included the whole of South Africa and the island of S. Helena, and which since has become the Church of the Province of South Africa, with its eight separate Dioceses.* Robert Gray was the son of that courageous Bishop of Bristol who refused to quit his Cathedral when his life was threatened by a revolutionary mob. Urged by his Clergy to fly for his life, the brave old Bishop declined to give up the usual service, and simply replied, "I am to regard my duty to God and not the fear of men." The chivalrous boldness of the father was intensified in the son. Robert Gray began, continued, and ended his life "stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord" (I Cor. xv. 58). As a

* The number is now increased to ten, by the founding of the new Dioceses of Mashonaland and Lebombo by the Provincial Synod of 1891.

parish priest in England, he left the impress of a devoted life wherever he ministered. "Holy Orders," he says, "was the determination of my childhood, and the desire grew up with me." His work was engrained into his life. He did not seek the perils of leadership, although he dared not refuse the arduous task to which he was called. The ties of home and family, which rooted him so deeply in England, were at once broken at the call of duty, and he set forth boldly to plant the Church in the spiritual wilderness of South Africa.

He had a difficult problem to solve. The overwhelming majority of Dutch Calvinists rested upon a tenure of well-nigh two hundred years' undisturbed possession of the field. The country had been some forty years under British rule, to the strengthening of almost every form of sectarianism and the consequent weakening of the few scattered congregations who professed adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. He welded together the few Clergy whom he found in the country, and he drew to his standard an earnest band of fellow-workers, who emulated their leader's faith and courage. Foremost amongst them was Archdeacon Merriman, who was subsequently elected Bishop of Grahamstown, whose recent death is a loss to the Church in South Africa, which those who knew and loved him dare hardly yet attempt to

estimate. The Bishop and his Archdeacon worked heart and soul together to plant the Church in the land of their adoption. They were "in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in journeyings often," over the then roadless wastes, of South Africa, gathering a few Churchmen here and there to worship in isolated hamlets and scattered farm houses, forming new parishes, building new Churches, lengthening their cords and strengthening their stakes by a wise organisation, which taught men's minds to grasp the idea that the daughter Churches of the Colonies might fairly claim the legitimate independence of Provincial action without in any way forfeiting their union with the Mother Church.

The subdivision of his See was Bishop Gray's first step in this direction, and the litigation into which he was unwillingly forced by his firm adherence to Synodical action,* positively furthered the cause he had at heart. Men were forced to look at first principles, and were taught to see that the Church of England and the English Church were not coterminous, and that the establishment of the mother provinces of Canterbury and York was the *accident*, and not the *essence*, of their being. Gradually the idea gained strength that the Anglican Communion was a federation of unestablished and autonomous Provinces in union and communion with the Mother

* The well-known case, "*Long v. The Bishop of Capetown.*"

Church of England, and the Patriarchal See of Canterbury.

Men were prepared for the grand struggle with Erastianism in South Africa, when a secular Court in England sent back a Bishop, who had been canonically deposed from his See, to exercise all the authority Letters Patent could give him as titular Bishop of Natal. God forbid that I should heedlessly disinter the ashes of a buried and half-forgotten controversy ! Alas ! for South Africa, the leaven of evil produced by the schism and heresy of Dr. Colenso is still potent for mischief, and the recent decision of the Privy Council in the Grahamstown case has still further expanded the sphere and scope of the heretical body which, by a cruel irony, has chosen to call itself the "Church of England" in South Africa. It is more needful than ever to set before English Churchmen the details and issues of the struggle so nobly fought out by Bishop Gray, and so faithfully maintained after his death by my late Diocesan, Bishop Merriman.

Our first duty is to note the tenderness, patience, and long-suffering shewn by our late Metropolitan in dealing with Dr. Colenso. He plied in vain every argument which his friendship could dictate to win over his erring brother to the Catholic Faith. He acted most deliberately and carefully when action became an inevitable necessity. He took counsel

with the Bishops of England, and acted upon their advice in citing Dr. Colenso, as his Suffragan, to answer for his errors before the Court of his Metropolitan. The details of that trial, with all its patient judicial fairness, are before the world, and with deep sorrow of heart the erring Bishop was deposed from his See. It is well known, too, how Dr. Colenso evaded his oath of obedience to Bishop Gray as his Metropolitan, and how he appealed successfully to the secular law-courts to confirm him in the possession of his episcopal income—an income, by the way, derived from the alms of Church-people, who rightfully abhorred his denial of the doctrines of the Church. The spiritual jurisdiction of the Metropolitan was threatened by the Civil Power. Loyal Churchmen in England and in South Africa were sorely perturbed and perplexed. Men began to wonder whether the Romanist taunt that England's Church is the creature of Acts of Parliament might not after all prove a true one. Good men and personal friends perplexed his mind with wavering and timorous counsels, but God strengthened Robert Gray to contend earnestly for the Faith, and to shew men in these latter days that the Catholic Church is *not* the creature of the Civil Power.

In this crisis of the Church in South Africa he was *stedfast* and *unmoveable*, a very *Athanasius contra mundum*. The Metropolitan boldly asserted the

spiritual liberties of the Church by solemnly excommunicating the deposed Bishop, and consecrating a successor to his vacant See. His act was promptly acknowledged by the Churches of America and Canada, and was recognised as valid throughout the Anglican Communion. The figment of State supremacy was for ever brushed away from the daughter Churches of the Colonies, and the firm decision of Bishop Gray must be accounted as a turning-point in English Church history.

After this heavy trial and great conflict God permitted His faithful servant to close his days in comparative rest and peace. He saw the distracted Diocese of Natal restored to peace and order, under the wise, firm, and gentle rule of the present Bishop of Maritzburg.* He presided at the Provincial Synod of 1870, which formed the Constitution and Canons of the Church of the Province of South Africa.

The work was well and wisely done. The legitimate independence of provincial action was preserved without severing one single tie binding South African Churchmen to the Mother Church. I am aware that the Privy Council believes we have severed ourselves from the Mother Church, because we decline to accept Privy Council decisions on matters of faith and doctrine as of binding authority in our own Church

* Dr. Macrorie, now (1893) Canon of Ely.

Courts. I am aware that in the Grahamstown case the Privy Council announced its opinion that its own decisions in matters of faith and doctrine are part and parcel of the authoritative *credenda* of the Church of England.

The Church of England, as a corporate body, has never endorsed this view, and, please God, it never will. The Church of the Province of South Africa has declared that it cannot endorse this view, which would place our creeds at the mercy of the lawyers, and this action of ours cannot jeopardise our union with the Mother Church, whatever the Privy Council may say to the contrary.

I venture to prefer the opinion of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* to that of the Privy Council upon a point of this nature.

Loyalty to the historic chair of S. Augustine is a distinctive feature in all colonial Churchmen, and if his Grace the Archbishop, in the full consciousness of his Patriarchal position towards the whole Anglican Communion, could, in his recent letter to our Metropolitan, so fully declare our spiritual oneness with the Mother Church (and in so doing but express the plain English of our Constitution and Canons), I think that South African Churchmen need not greatly concern themselves with the opinion of a body of lay judges,

* The late Archbishop Tait.

even if that opinion cause us the loss of some Church property.

The work of Bishop Gray in organising the Church of the Province of South Africa was done on sound and Catholic lines. We cannot tamper with it in deference to the opinion of the Privy Council. Its permanence was unquestioned during his lifetime; for some two years after its completion the great Metropolitan laid down his crozier to wear his crown of life. In his own words of humility and hope he sank to rest,—“At the feet of my dear Lord for ever.”

His battle still remained to be fought by his faithful fellow-labourers. The Church property in Natal was consigned by the Civil Power into the hands of Dr. Colenso, just as the Cathedral at Grahamstown has been recently consigned into the hands of Dr. Williams. As the poet of the “Christian Year” most truly said, “It is a piece of the fourth century over again.” Once more the secular law-courts shield heresy, and orthodox Churchmen are forcibly deprived of their Church buildings, as in the days when Arianism was upheld by the State.

The Diocese of Maritzburg has had to build a new Cathedral and new Churches to replace the buildings given to Dr. Colenso by the decree of the State. The Diocese of Grahamstown has witnessed the shameful spectacle of Dr. Williams placing the deposed Bishop

of Natal in the episcopal throne of the lawful Bishop of the Diocese.*

But the loss of a Cathedral Church thus desecrated does not weigh heavily on the minds of the faithful Clergy and laity of the Diocese of Grahamstown; and although they would thankfully enough enter into possession of their own, nothing would induce them to make a disloyal pact with the secular law-courts, or to sacrifice the Constitution of the Church of South Africa for the sake of perishable bricks and mortar. When Bishop Merriman was laid to his rest last August, amidst the genuine grief and sympathy of the whole of his flock, his Clergy felt that their veteran leader had bequeathed them his battle to fight. They knew how tenderly, wisely, and firmly he had borne himself through the long struggle in which he had been engaged.

* I should have preferred not to allude to this painful fact, but it is necessary to point out the *completeness* of the schism of Dr. Colenso. When Dr. Williams, the schismatical and excommunicate Dean of Grahamstown, withdrew from the obedience of his lawful Diocesan, Bishop Merriman, he transferred his allegiance to Dr. Colenso, and invited him, as his Bishop, to preach and confirm in the Cathedral of Grahamstown, and Dr. Colenso, ready to welcome this latest seceder to his schism, travelled all the way from Maritzburg to Grahamstown, and ministered a schismatical confirmation in the Cathedral! Dr. Colenso was supposed to rely on his Letters Patent, but this invasion of Bishop Merriman's Cathedral lay quite beyond the bounds of his supposed jurisdiction under Letters Patent. [This note was penned in the stress and strain caused by the Privy Council judgment in the Grahamstown Cathedral case in 1882, which handed the building over to Dean Williams when he was in open schism.]

Peace has since been restored to the Diocese of Grahamstown, and the Cathedral is once more in possession of the lawful authorities of the Diocese.

Bishop Merriman left to the Church an example of Christian heroism not one whit behind that of Bishop Gray. I count it my highest privilege that I began my ministerial life in the Diocese of Lichfield under Bishop Selwyn, and that I was ordained deacon and priest by his Apostolic hands before the altar of this Cathedral ; but when, with his consent, I left this Diocese to work in the Diocese of Grahamstown, I found in Bishop Merriman a father in God like-minded with Bishop Selwyn in his careful rule and guidance of his Clergy and people. More than this I need not say of the Bishop and leader whom God has mysteriously removed from us just when, in human judgment, we seemed to need his leadership the most. He has added another noble name to the roll of our Christian heroes in these latter days. The Church, which counts amongst her sons such names as Selwyn, Gray, Merriman, Mackenzie, Paterson, and Steere, may well take courage and go forward.

I count it the brightest memory of my brief visit to England that the sympathy of English Churchmen has been so strongly manifested towards the Church of our Province in its trials and perplexities.

I need hardly say that I feel deeply grateful to the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield for the privilege of occupying this Cathedral pulpit, and that I regard their kindness as a special mark of sympathy shewn to the Church in South Africa in its present struggles

and difficulties. Such outward tokens of unity and sympathy tend to knit the daughter Churches still more closely to the Mother Church of England, and I would fain trust that our common heritage in those great men who have so boldly defended the Faith may bind English Churchmen throughout the world heart and soul in the one Communion and Fellowship of Christ's Holy Catholic Church.

God grant that these noble memories may be fruitful in our own hearts and lives ! These champions of the Faith are knit to us in the blessed communion of the saints. Their earnest contention for the Faith was *for us*. We have need to be steadfast in these days of shifting thought-currents and eddying whirlwinds of false doctrine. Let us take our stand upon the Faith once delivered to the saints, the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* of undivided Christendom. Let us guard the Ark of God from perils within and foes without, laxity in doctrine, and intrusions of Cæsar into the things of God. Then may we hope to be numbered amongst those blessed ones who, in robes washed white in the Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, shall stand before Him day and night in His Holy Temple for ever.

IV.

THE HOLY ORDERS OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

A Sermon preached in S. George's Cathedral, Grahams-town, at the Ordination of Priests holden by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, on Trinity Sunday, 1886.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE Prayer Book directs the preacher at an Ordination of Priests to declare “the duty and office of such as come to be admitted Priests; how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ, and also how the people ought to esteem them in their Office.”

The task of the preacher is a difficult one. His time is limited. He must endeavour to fulfil the requirements of the Rubric, and state plainly and clearly the doctrine of the Christian Priesthood, and he also feels bound to add a few words of brotherly counsel to those who come to be admitted Priests.

Since my sermon is published by request, I am venturing to add a short preface, in which I embody a few authoritative proofs of the statements which it contains. I endeavoured in my sermon to state as

plainly and clearly as I could the doctrine of Holy Orders which the Church of England holds and teaches. Our Church teaches this doctrine as a portion of "the faith once delivered to the saints." By teaching it she vindicates her position as a living branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, and traces her historical continuity to the day of Pentecost. By virtue of the Apostolic Succession of her Three-fold Ministry she guards and maintains the Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship, and offers herself as a centre of reunion amidst the divisions of Christendom, as well as the true spiritual home of all English speaking Christians. I must once more quote the oft-quoted words of Count de Maistre, a noble-hearted French Roman Catholic, who could recognise, even amidst the deadness of English Church life at the beginning of this century, the fact that our Mother Church may become the pivot of a reunited Christendom: "If ever Christians reunite, it seems likely that the impulse must start from the English Church. The English Church, which touches us on the one hand, touches on the other hand those whom we cannot touch. She is very precious, and, perhaps, capable of reconciling elements in-associable from their nature." Count de Maistre was able to see somewhat of the truth in which the famous theologian, Isaac Casaubon, had found rest for his soul, namely, that the English

Church stands upon the firm basis of the Christianity of the first five centuries—the *historical* faith of undivided Christendom.

It is most important to grasp the connection between the Apostolic Ministry and the Apostolic Faith. Calvin's rejection of the Apostolic Ministry, and his substitution of the Presbyterian system which he invented, has failed to preserve the integrity of the Christian Faith in Geneva and Holland. It is not many years since a preacher was ejected from his pulpit in Geneva for preaching the doctrine of our Lord's Godhead. The Calvinistic Presbyterianism of the Pilgrim Fathers who colonised New England has become Unitarian to a very great degree, and the same downward development from Presbyterianism and Independency has taken place in England, so that buildings erected by congregations believing in the Trinity and Incarnation are now in the hands of Unitarians by right of legitimate succession from the original builders.

The only *sound* guarantee for the maintenance of the Apostolic Faith is the continuance and permanence of the Apostolic Ministry.

I.—What is the Apostolic Ministry?

It is the Ministry committed by our Blessed Lord to His Apostles, and by them transmitted in its threefold Order and unbroken line of succession to the Holy Catholic Church as the channel of

sacramental grace and instrument of orderly government.

Our Lord said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth; go ye *therefore* and make disciples of all nations" (S. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19). "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you" (S. John xx. 21). He thus invested the Apostles and their successors with full ministerial powers. I use the words "their successors" advisedly, for if they had *no successors*, and if their ministerial commission died with them, our Lord's words, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (S. Matt. xxviii. 20), would be emptied of their true meaning. They mean plainly that our Lord would be *with* the Apostolic Ministry *even unto the end of the world*. It is useless to suggest that the Apostolic Commission given to the Apostles expired with them *because the Bishops who succeeded them had not their powers of working miracles*. This miraculous power was a *temporary* gift to the Apostles, as the first Bishops of the Church, just the like power was a *temporary* gift to the first believers. We read of the "signs that shall follow them that believe" (S. Mark xvi. 17). It is beside the mark to argue that none can be believers *now*, unless they can cast out devils and drink poisons unharmed, as the first believers did. It is equally beside the mark to argue that Bishops like S. Timothy or S. Polycarp, or S. Irenæus, were

not successors to the Apostles, because we do not read of their possessing the special miraculous gifts of S. Paul or S. Peter.

The Apostles, therefore, transmitted to their successors, the Bishops, the plenitude of ministerial power. They formed a Threefold Ministry. First they created the Order of Deacons (*Acts vi. 6; vii. 2*). They gave them authority to preach and baptise. Next they founded the Order of Presbyters or Priests (*Acts xx. 17-28*), and committed to this second Order of the Ministry full ministerial power, excepting Confirmation and Ordination. Then, lastly, as S. Clement of Rome says, "The Apostles ordained certain men to the end that when they should have fallen asleep in death, others of approved character should succeed to their special Office" (*S. Clem., I., ad Cor., 44*). Thus S. Paul consecrated S. Titus as Bishop of Crete, and S. Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus. S. Titus received special instructions from S. Paul as to the exercise of his episcopal authority in ordaining Priests (*Titus i. 5*). S. Timothy is directed how to exercise his episcopal jurisdiction in the trial of a Priest (*I. Tim. v. 19, 20*).

In the Revelation of S. John, the Bishops of the Seven Churches of Asia are addressed by the title of "Messengers." They are reproved for their faults, and solemnly held responsible to God for the condition of their Dioceses.

We can thus briefly justify the confident appeal of our Church to Holy Scripture upon the matter of the Threefold Apostolic Ministry. Her claim that her teaching on this point is "*evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture*" is expressed strongly, but her strength of expression is more than justified by the facts of the case.

She appeals just as confidently to those "Ancient Authors," the Fathers of the Church.

The testimony of S. Ignatius is conclusive. He was the disciple of the Apostle S. John, and was Bishop of Antioch about A.D. 112. In his letter to S. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, he upholds the authority of the Threefold Ministry in very plain language, "Give ye heed to the Bishop, that God also may give heed unto you. My soul be for those who submit to the rule of the Bishop, Priests, and Deacons; may I have my portion with them in God" (Ign. ad Polycarpum, vi.). The testimony of S. Ignatius is so inconvenient for Presbyterians, and others who impugn the authority of the Apostolic Ministry, that vigorous attempts have been made to disprove the genuineness of his seven Epistles. The recent edition of S. Ignatius, by Bishop Lightfoot of Durham, so conclusively disposes of these criticisms that they can never be seriously raised again.

We have like testimony as to the authority of the

Threefold Ministry from S. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 124), Tertullian (A.D. 200), and Origen (A.D. 230).

S. Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage (A.D. 250), clearly explains and enforces the authority of the Threefold Apostolic Ministry, and the question of its carefully transmitted *succession* is disposed of by S. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons (A.D. 180). He says: "*We are able to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted Bishops in the Churches, and to demonstrate the succession of these men to our own times.*" A little further on he links the Apostolic Faith with the succession of the Apostolic Ministry, as he writes of "*the Faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the Bishops*" (Iren. adv. Haer., iii., 3).

The language of the Preface to our Ordinal as to the testimony of the Fathers of the Church is thus clearly vindicated.

It remains for me briefly to shew that the Church of England really possesses the Apostolic Orders which she considers necessary to the *being* of a Living Branch of the Church Catholic. I do not intend to slay the slain by disproving the oft-disproved calumnies of Roman Catholic controversialists, with regard to the Consecration of Archbishop Parker. Most educated Roman Catholics know that Archbishop Parker's Consecration was as valid as Cardinal Pole's. But the pivot of the controversy

has shifted. It would be useless to the Romanists if they could prove the absolute non-existence of Archbishop Parker, for the Anglican succession does not depend upon him. His successor, Archbishop Grindal, was consecrated by Bishops Hodgkins and Scorey, who were both consecrated *before* Archbishop Parker, during Cranmer's Primacy. The Roman Catholics do not *now* direct their attack on the regularity of our succession. The point aimed at is the validity of our mission and jurisdiction. They hold that outward mission and authority from the Pope of Rome is necessary to all valid ministrations. The Church of England denies this position. So does the whole Eastern Church,—the Church of ninety millions of our fellow Christians. The historical Christianity of the first five centuries knew nothing of such claims. S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine would have repudiated them as definitely as S. Athanasius, S. Chrysostom, or S. Basil. The position of the Papacy towards the Church of England was by implication condemned by the first four General Councils of the Church.

But we have to consider objections from other quarters.

There is the objection that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession has been made the basis of a wrongful hierarchical spirit, and that it has ministered to the encouragement of a narrow clericalism. But Apostolic

Succession does not concern the Ministry *alone*. It is the common heritage of the whole Catholic Church, as the Body of Christ. The Threefold Apostolic Ministry are the *Organs of the Body*. The Apostolic Succession of the *laity*, as a “chosen generation, a Royal Priesthood,” is just as necessary a fact of Christian belief as the Apostolic Succession of the Clergy.

There are persons with ample capacity for setting aside facts they do not wish to believe, and manifest incapacity for patient and independent historical research, who decline to accept the Apostolic Succession of the Threefold Ministry as a *fact* of Church History. A reference to such a well-known work as the “*Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*,” by the Bishop of Chester, ought to satisfy everyone who is not determined to remain “invincibly ignorant.” That work contains the record of the consecrations of the Anglican Episcopate, from the consecration of S. Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury on Nov. 16th, A.D. 597, to the consecration of the late Archbishop Tait, on Nov. 23rd, 1856. S. Augustine was consecrated by Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles, in France, and thus traced his succession to the Apostles through the Church of S. Irenæus of Lyons. Here is *one* independent line of Apostolic descent. But S. Augustine found an Apostolic Church in Wales, tracing its succession to

the first preachers of Christianity in Britain. In A.D. 314 three British Bishops sat in the Council of Arles to represent the Church of Britain. The very fact of their presence at this Council proves that they were lawfully consecrated Bishops, and that the Church which they represented possessed the Threefold Apostolic Ministry. Here, then, is a *second* independent line of Apostolic descent in the British Bishops. On March 26th, A.D. 668, Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus was consecrated by Vitalian, Bishop of Rome, and Patriarch of the West. Here is a *third* distinct line of Apostolic Succession traced to S. Peter and S. Paul through the Bishops of Rome. Archbishop Theodore reconciled the British Bishops and formed one united Church of England. Although other links in the chain of Apostolic Succession were formed from time to time, there are few so noteworthy as the case of Archbishop Laud, who was consecrated on Nov. 18th, 1621, by George Monteigne, Bishop of London, John Howson, Bishop of Oxford, and the Bishops of Ely, Worcester, and Chichester. One of Bishop Monteigne's consecrators, when he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln, was the Italian Archbishop of Spalato, who thus brought in the *Italian* line of Apostolic Succession. Bishop Howson brought in the *Irish* line of Apostolic Succession, traced from S. Patrick, who was consecrated in A.D. 432, by Celestinus, the forty-third Bishop of Rome in direct

descent from S. Peter and S. Paul, and also traced to Hugh Curwen, the Marian Archbishop of Dublin, who was consecrated in S. Paul's Cathedral, London, on Sept. 8th, 1555, by Bonner and other Bishops. The fact that the present Irish Bishops derive their orders from Archbishop Curwen has silenced all Roman cavils as to their validity. Here, in the case of Archbishop Laud, we have the meeting place of *five distinct lines* of Apostolic Succession, namely, the three English lines, the Irish, and the Italian. But it is inadequate to lay stress upon single lines of succession. We cannot compare the Apostolic Succession of Bishops to a series of *isolated chains*, for the succession of Bishops is interwoven like a piece of *chain armour*. Each Bishop must have three consecrators, although one consecrator is sufficient to ensure valid consecration. By this precaution the Church multiplies and intertwines the network of Apostolic Succession. To give an instance. The late Metropolitan Bishop Gray was consecrated in 1846, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and eight other Bishops. Each of these nine consecrators was himself consecrated by three other Bishops, which gives twenty-seven lines of Episcopal Succession converging on Bishop Gray. Trace back another step, and we have eighty-one lines of succession interwoven on Bishop Gray. I need not press the argument into a bewildering maze

of figures. The literal fact of the Apostolic Succession of the English Episcopate is by historical evidence placed beyond the sphere of dispute.

And now let us consider the spiritual side of the Doctrine of the Apostolic Succession of the Three-fold Ministry.

It teaches us that our Lord set up a visible polity on earth, a spiritual society organised under His own Rule and Kingship, and governed under Him by His Apostles and their successors in the Threefold Apostolic Ministry. It teaches us that this Ministry is the divinely appointed channel of Sacramental Grace and blessing. It teaches us that the visible polity of the Church Catholic is God's revealed method for saving the souls and bodies of men, from the curse and power of sin. As branches of the True Vine, we abide in Christ by participation in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. The Sacrament of the Altar depends for its validity upon the ministration of a Priest validly ordained, and no valid Ordination is possible except by the hands of a Bishop, who is a lawful successor of the Apostles.

The spiritual consequences and issues of a valid Apostolic Ministry are thus bound up by God with the life of individual souls. By rightly using that Ministry we are enabled fully to realise our privileges as members of Christ. And God has revealed no other way. There is *One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*

and one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church governed by One Threefold Apostolic Ministry.

But what of the position of those who, through no fault of their own, have rejected the One Ministry appointed by God, and who cleave to religious organisations and ministries of human appointment? We must call their ministers what Wesley called his. They are "Lay Preachers," and do not possess the Apostolic Commission. They do not claim to be Priests of the Catholic Church, and the fact that they do not claim the supernatural authority and powers of the Priesthood renders it easier for us to deal personally with them in a spirit of brotherly tenderness and courtesy. We can do all this, nay more, it is our bounden duty, but we must bear our unflinching witness against heresy and schism. We must remember that these ministries of human appointment are the outcome of a sectarianism which breaks the power of the Church in the world, and notably in the Mission field. The missionary failures of the nineteenth century contrast miserably with the missionary triumphs of the undivided Church of the first five centuries. The unhappy divisions of Christendom, and especially amongst English-speaking Christians, are one main cause of missionary failure.

With regard to the separated laity, I would quote the words of Canon Liddon, whose well-weighed utterances must command our thoughtful attention.

“Communion with the visible Body of Christ is necessary in order to full participation in the blessings of Redemption. But it does not follow that those who, through no fault of their own, have forfeited this Communion are therefore shut out of all privileges of the Gospel. They may belong, in S. Augustine’s words, to the soul, if not to the body of the Church of Christ. They may have been grafted into the Holy Body by One Sacrament, and have gradually parted from it, in this life of temptation and sin, through lack of another. That which, in our belief, and to our sorrow the non-Episcopal communities lack, is a share in any of those privileges which depend upon a Ministry duly authorised by Christ our Lord; and especially do they lack the precious Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Even here, when dissent from His Church is determined by a motive of loyalty to what is believed to be His Will, we may trust that He supplies to earnest souls some blessings which they neglect to seek through the Chartered Channels; although there must always be danger of forfeiting grace which is not regularly strengthened, and of losing hold on truth which is not held in its revealed completeness.” (Canon Liddon’s Sermon, “A Father in Christ.” Introduction, pp. 38, 39.)

A man can carry on a maimed and crippled life if he has lost by disease or accident some of the chief organs of the human body. But the life he

lives is not the same *full life* that he would have lived if he had not suffered the loss. The analogy holds good with regard to those Christian communities which have lost those Organs of the Body of Christ, which He has provided for their use in the appointed ministrations of the Threefold Apostolic Ministry.

Thus far I have endeavoured, however inadequately, to touch upon some salient points suggested by the statements of my sermon, and I humbly pray that the truths I have striven to illustrate may not have suffered in my treatment of them.

ORDINATION SERMON.

“What mean ye by this Service?”—EXOD. xii. 26.

THERE are certain persons who have convinced themselves that the Religion of Jesus Christ can dispense with all outward ceremonies and observances. But these persons will never persuade thoughtful Christians to follow them, until they can explain away the fact that man has a body as well as a soul. The spiritual necessities of our complex being demand that we shall worship and serve God with our *bodies*, as well as with our *souls*, and our Lord Jesus Christ has made provision for combining this service of body and soul in the Sacraments and Worship of the Church Catholic.

The "outward and visible sign" conveys to the faithful "the inward and spiritual grace."

The "Venite" at Mattins calls us to an act of devout and spiritual worship. But the inward worship of the soul finds its expression in the outward worship of the body. We "*kneel before the Lord our Maker.*" We kneel upon our knees to express by the outward humility of our bodies the inward humility of our souls.

The religious observance of kneeling has thus a distinct and definite meaning.

A religious observance that has lost its meaning thereby ceases to have any religious efficacy, because it ceases to be a help to bind the souls and bodies of men to the Throne of the Living God. Thus we grasp the fact that every outward religious observance must have its distinct and definite inner meaning.

In Exod. xii. Moses was most careful to explain to the Israelites the meaning of the elaborate ceremonial of the Jewish Passover. He foresaw that its inner symbolism might be lost in generations to come. He foresaw that children yet unborn might question their parents and ask, "*What mean ye by this Service?*" and he took care that a clear, definite, and distinct answer should be ready. We are not concerned to-day to deal with that answer further than to observe that the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover

foreshadowed the One Sacrifice of Calvary, just as the Holy Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Christian Passover, perpetuates and continues for us in solemn memorial before God that One Sacrifice. The special point before us is the care which Moses took to teach the Israelites the true inner meaning of the outward ceremonial they were bidden to adopt.

“*What mean ye by this Service?*” is a question which concerns the Sacraments and Worship of the Church Catholic to the end of time. It is a question which concerns Clergy and laity alike. We are here to-day to unite with our Bishop and Chief Pastor in a glorious act of Eucharistic prayer and worship before the Altar of the Mother Church of this Diocese, during which he will administer the Sacramental Office and Rite which our Church has appointed for the Ordination of Priests. Need I add that this solemn occasion, fraught as it is with important issues for the welfare of this Diocese, causes Clergy and laity from a distance to feel with the Psalmist, “*I was glad when they said unto me, we will go unto the House of the Lord*” (Ps. cxxii. 1), and to rejoice that the whole Diocese may look to this Cathedral centre as our “*Jerusalem that is built as a city that is in unity with itself!*” (Ps. cxxii. 3). *Not unto us, O Lord, but unto Thy Name give the praise* (Ps. cxv. 41), *Who makest men to be of one mind in a house*, Whose Loving Spirit hath vouchsafed to lead this city and

Diocese into the way of Peace ;—Peace through the Truth.*

Let us now, with God's help, endeavour to answer the question, What mean ye by this Service? What does the Church of England mean by her solemn Service for the Ordination of men to the Office and work of Priests in the Church of God? Let us first carefully examine what she says. In the 23rd Article she says that all Christian Ministers must be " lawfully called and sent." In the Ordinal and its Preface she tells us first *what* the Christian Ministry is ; secondly, *how* men are lawfully called and sent to execute that Ministry, and lastly she defines for us the *authority* of that Ministry. Her statements are carefully balanced and weighed, and the teaching of our Ordinal upon the Christian Ministry receives a further authoritative sanction and endorsement from the 36th Article, which defends and enforces its use.

I do not think that the majority of Christian people considers the question of the authority and commission of the Christian Ministry an idle one. I am aware that a minority thinks that the whole question is utterly unimportant, and that some are ready to view the Minister of Christ as a lecturer on religious subjects, hired on a quarterly salary, whose

* The Cathedral Church at Grahamstown, which had been severed from the Diocese by the schismatic action of the late Dean Williams, had at this time just been restored to the Diocese.

authority as a minister is derived from the persons who pay him to preach to them so long as he happens to please them. But I need not detain you to reason out a self-evident fallacy.

The Church of England considers the question of the Christian Ministry an all-important matter. In the Preface to the Ordinal she tells us plainly first of all, *what this ministry is.* She tells us that "*it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.*"

It is evident unto all men, she confidently asserts (upon the testimony of the Bible and the Fathers of the Church), that the Christian Ministry consists of *Three distinct Orders,* tracing their historical continuity and existence to the Apostolic age. She leaves no loophole for the judgment of any who do not believe that Episcopacy is Apostolic. She plainly states in so many words that Christians who do not believe in the authority of a Threefold Apostolic Ministry have not grasped a fact "*evident unto all men,*" which they might easily have grasped if they diligently studied Holy Scripture and the writings of the Fathers of the Church.

She then tells us *how* men are lawfully called and sent forth as ministers of Christ. She says there is *only one way,—the way of the Threefold Apostolic*

Ministry. Her words are as follows:—“*To the intent that these Orders (of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons) may be continued and reverently used and esteemed, no man shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.*” Here she states *plainly* that no one is lawfully consecrated or ordained unless he hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.

See what a clear position the Church of England takes up. A Priest of the Roman Catholic Church, or of the Greek Church can join our Church and minister at our Altars without re-ordination, because he has been episcopally ordained. A minister of any non-episcopal body of Christians must be re-ordained before he can minister in our Church. I give two notable historical instances. In the reign of James I. the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Spalato, in Italy, joined the Church of England, and was made Dean of Windsor. He was, as a matter of course, acknowledged as a lawfully consecrated Bishop, and in that capacity assisted at the consecration of Monteigne, Bishop of Lincoln, in the year 1617.

In the reign of Charles II. John Sharp, an eminent Scotch Presbyterian Minister, was consecrated Arch-

bishop of S. Andrew's. But he was previously ordained Deacon and Priest, and his Presbyterian Ordination was treated as invalid, because it was not Episcopal Ordination. We here deal with questions of plain fact.

What, then, does the Church of England mean by thus treating Episcopal Ordination as absolutely necessary, and treating all non-Episcopal Ordination as, *ipso facto*, invalid?

If the question of Episcopacy were merely one of antiquarian interest,—if Episcopacy and the Threefold Apostolic Ministry were only a more useful and practical form of Church order and government than other schemes of organisation, our Church is absolutely without excuse.

We should have no possible justification in denying the validity of non-Episcopal Ordinations, accepted as they are by so many learned, pious, and devout fellow Christians. If Episcopacy touched only the *well-being* of the Church, we dare not interpose it as a barrier between ourselves and our separated brethren. But in the judgment of the Church of England, Apostolic Episcopacy involves the very *being* of the visible Church of Christ. She considers it the only means whereby we maintain the permanence and continuity of that Threefold Ministry which Christ ordained to perpetuate the Sacramental Life of His Church. The Church of England holds that there is

only one valid Ministry in the Church of Christ, and only one form of organisation which our Lord commanded His visible Church to adopt. She considers this question of Episcopacy to be vital and central.

To prove her position from Scripture and the Fathers would trespass alike upon your time and patience.

Our Mother Church considers her position on this matter "*evident unto all men*," and we accept her conclusion. She means by her Ordinal to assert that no valid Ordination can take place except by the imposition of hands of a Bishop, who is a lawfully consecrated successor of the Apostles.

The orderly succession of the Bishops of the English Church throughout the world, from the Apostles of our Lord, is a plain and indisputable historical fact.

We now come to the question of the authority of the Christian Ministry. What authority does the Church of England mean to convey to her Clergy by this Service? As a living Branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, she conveys the same Commission, the same Authoritative Ministry of reconciliation and Sacramental grace, which our Lord conveyed to His Apostles, and through them to the first Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of His Church. By the solemn Service of to-day our Bishop, as the successor of the Apostles, will convey this sacred Commission and Authority to those who will be ordained to the

Priesthood. He will lay his hands upon them, and the assembled Priests will unite in this act, not as sharing his prerogative of Ordination, but in token of their assent to the admission of the candidates into the Holy fellowship of the Priesthood. As he lays his hands upon each one he will say these solemn words, *Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our Hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacra- ments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

By these sacred and awful words, the Sacramental grace of Holy Order is conveyed. Their meaning is plain. They embody the words of our Lord's Commission to His Apostles. They set forth S. Paul's definition of the Priesthood as Stewards of the mysteries of God.

Moreover it is required of Stewards that a man be found faithful (I. Cor. iv. 2). The Church carefully and publicly questions her Candidates for the Priesthood, so that the laity may hear what she requires them to *mean* by their Ordination Vows. You will hear them first of all express their own sincerity of purpose and firm belief in the Apostolic Orders of the English Church.

Then they will solemnly declare their belief in Holy Scripture as the authoritative guide to their teaching.

Then they promise to minister the Doctrine, Sacraments, and Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, thus subjecting their own private judgment to the authority of the Catholic Church, as conveyed to them by the Creeds and Formularies of the Church of England.

In the next place, they declare their readiness to defend the Catholic Faith against erroneous and strange doctrines, and to discharge diligently their cure of souls by ministering to the sick and whole as need shall require and occasion shall be given.

They also promise to be diligent in Prayer and in the study of Holy Scripture and Theology, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh.

They promise guarded watchfulness and care in their own lives and households, that they may be examples to the flock of Christ.

And, lastly, they promise obedience to the Bishop and other chief Ministers to whom he may commit the charge and government over them.

This is the *pith* and *meaning* of the Vows of Ordination.

Let us now think of those who will make these Vows to-day. It is the most solemn day of their lives. Henceforth God's Power and Commandment is upon them to declare and pronounce to His

people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.

It is their duty to refuse this grace to the manifestly impenitent, and to guard God's Altar from the intrusion of evil doers as the Church in her Rubrics directs. It is theirs henceforth to minister at the Altar of God and to offer the memorial Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Angels of God have not this dignity committed to them. Our Saviour has committed it to the Priests of His Church.

Ah, my brothers, you will feel as the Bishop's hands are laid upon you this day, *Who is sufficient for these things?* You will feel with Isaiah, "*Woe is me! for I am a man of unclean lips*" (Isaiah vi. 5). You will feel with Jeremiah, "*Ah! Lord God, behold, I cannot speak, for I am a child*" (Jer. i. 6).

But the Gift of the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God will be yours. You will be touched with a live coal from the Altar of Heaven. You can say with S. Paul, "*Our sufficiency is of God*" (II. Cor. iii. 5). Bear with me for a moment as I remind you of the store of heavenly power which will be committed to you this day. It will never fail you unless you for your parts fail to stir up the gift given you by the Laying on of Hands. Believe me when I tell you that every ministerial failure, all lack of spiritual influence, all the sins and manifold infirmities, which visit the priestly life, flow

from a want of realisation of the gift we have received and the office we hold.

Personal religion of a *definite* character must be ours to begin with or else we should never dare to stand and speak our Ordination Vows before God and the congregation with a lie in our right hands. But something *more* than the personal religion of a pious layman is demanded of us who are chosen to lead and guide the souls of others. Sin in a priest is far worse than sin in a layman ; mocking fiends rejoice over our fall. We are chosen as leaders in God's conflict against the powers of darkness, and the failure or fall of a leader causes the enemies of God to blaspheme. How can we guide our people into the way of peace if they do not see us walking in that way ourselves ? The Good Shepherd says of the faithful pastor, "*He goeth before them and the sheep follow him*" (S. John x. 4). Do we go before our people ? Do they feel that our lives agree with our sermons, and that contact with us, helps them to a higher spiritual level ? They ought to feel this, nay more, they *must* feel it, if our ministry is to stand the test of the Great Day of Judgment.

Listen, my dear brothers, to the words of one whose voice was once heard within these consecrated walls, listen to the pious and wise counsel of Bishop Armstrong, the first Bishop of this Diocese.

"I am set as an example to the flock. O Christ, what

a work of personal holiness must I seek to fulfil in myself through the Power of the Holy Ghost! Of all the souls committed to me, mine should be the most pure, unworldly, unselfish, mortified, gentle, spiritual. Even so I must preach to Thee, through mine own life, and be myself a sermon to my flock. While I invite them to Heaven, I should be seen walking Heavenward myself, I should have experience of the way, I should be nearer to Thee than any; not behind any, but before all, a pattern of true devotion, Godly ardour, unworldliness, charity in speech and action."

It is even so, my brothers, the good Bishop's words of loving counsel touch the *very centre* of the priestly life. The personal holiness of each individual Priest is the measure of his ministry in the sight of God. Here is the true meaning of our Ordination Vows. Christ ordained His Apostles "*to be with Him*" (S. Mark iii. 14). Christ ordains us *to be with Him* in the nineteenth century just as He did His Apostles in the first. We must be with Him, as the constant law of our priestly life. Think of the power of thus realising His Presence. Men marvelled at the spiritual power of the unlettered fishermen of Galilee. But they traced it to its source. *They took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus* (Acts iv. 13). But how are we to be with Jesus? S. Paul shews us the way when he wrote to S. Timothy:

Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine (I. Tim. iv. 16). We are ready enough to take heed that our *doctrines* are orthodox and clearly expressed. Woe be unto us if our trumpets give forth an uncertain sound! But, my brothers, are we so ready to take heed to ourselves—our own spiritual lives? Ah, if it should be said of us, *They made me the keeper of the vineyards, but mine own vineyard have I not kept!*" (Canticles i. 6).

We must be men of holy lives and we must diligently cultivate habits of personal devotion. Our Church binds us to a daily recitation of her daily Mattins and Evensong, either publicly or privately, and a loving obedience to her Orders will in itself help to form us in habits of devotion. But to be with Him we must set apart a stated time for daily meditation. We cannot take heed unto the *doctrine* without daily reading and weighing of the Scripture and systematic study of theology. We cannot take heed unto *ourselves* without a determined resolve to make time every day to be alone with God, however much we may be harassed and pressed by other duties. *Alone with Jesus* we shall develop the grace of Holy Orders which He has given us. We shall gain wisdom, love, and sympathy in our pastoral intercourse with people. We shall gain power, earnestness, and definiteness in our teaching. We shall gain a spirit of loyal obedience to the Church

and to the Bishop as our spiritual leader and chief, as well as a spirit of brotherly tenderness and consideration in our dealings with one another.

My brothers, we must be like Christ. We must faithfully follow our Great High Priest, for it is *His* Priesthood, in all its tender ministrations and infinite power of Intercession, which *we* share. *What mean ye by this Service?* Only mean to do as He wills, and His Grace will surely enable you to fulfil His will in your Ministry, trusting the abiding power of His promise, "*Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*" (S. Matt. xxviii. 20).

V.

THE LIBERTY OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

*A Sermon preached in S. Mary's, Port Elizabeth, on the
Third Sunday after the Epiphany, 1877.*

THE following Prefatory Note was prefixed to this sermon when it was first published :—

The two main systems which fill the religious horizon of the average Englishman are Romanism and Protestantism. Romanism he is apt to value at its own estimate as the sole representative of traditional and historical Christianity, which, nevertheless, his common sense leads him to reject; and Protestantism he takes to be a new religion founded by Luther and Calvin, which he values almost more for its negations of Roman doctrine than for its affirmations of Christian truth. He is content to acquiesce in the dictum that Christianity fell asleep with the Apostles, and did not wake again till the Reformation, and thoughtlessly allows Romanism an almost undisputed sway with regard to the fifteen intervening centuries. But this loose way of viewing things is an essential source of weakness.

Those intervening centuries must *not be given up*. What if we find a *tertium quid*—a religion neither Romanist nor Protestant in the popular sense of the word—a religion that can say to Romanism, for the first fifteen centuries, “I am older and more venerable than you; I claim all true tradition and true history as mine”—a religion that can say to the popular Protestantism of the last three centuries: “I invite your sympathy and allegiance, in that I make a far more irrefragable protest against Romanism than you can.” This religion is called the Catholic Faith, and its protest is indeed invincible; the protest of tradition—the protest of history—the protest of holy and venerable names, of the martyrs, confessors, and doctors of the early Church, the protest of the Bishops of Christendom in solemn council assembled, the protest of Holy Writ and of our Saviour and His Apostles. This is the protest against Romanism of the Holy Eastern Church, the Church of S. Chrysostom and S. Basil—the Church of ninety millions of our fellow-Christians—this is the protest of the English Church, the voice of the English Reformation, the teaching of the English Prayer Book—this is the protest involved in our Creed, “I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,” which is neither Romanism, Protestantism, Rationalism, or any other “ism,” but which was founded by Christ Himself, and which He *has kept* and *will keep* steadfast until the

end of time. Romanism, or, in other words, the deflection of the Roman obedience from Primitive Catholicity, can only successfully be combated by a clear shewing forth of the principles of the Catholic Faith. Popular Protestantism, in clearing away the overlaying additions and accretions which Romanism heaped over the Catholic Faith, has, unfortunately, cleared away *too much*. In rooting up the tares it has, alas! rooted up some of the wheat also. But the English Church has cleared away neither too much nor too little. She stands before the world as the truest and purest representative of primitive Catholicity that exists, as a living branch of the Church of Christ. In God's providence she may be the pivot and rallying point of a reunited Christendom. She is Catholic, and therefore can unite with the venerable and Catholic Church of the East and with her sister Churches of the West, when in God's good time they cast off the Papal despotism and follow the steps of the old Catholics of Germany and Holland. She is anti-Romanist, and, therefore, she can hold out a hand to Lutheranism, and to all orthodox forms of Protestantism as a means for their restoration to visible and corporate unity. This is the view of the famous Count de Maistre, who, though a strong ultramontane, did not allow his Romanism completely to obscure his spiritual vision with regard to a future reunion. He says: "Si jamais les Chrétiens se rap-

prochent, il semble que le motion doit partir de l'Eglise de l'Angleterre. Le Presbyterianisme fut une œuvre Francaise, et par consequent une œuvre exagérée. L'Eglise Anglicane, qui nous touche d'une main, touche de l'autre ceux que nous ne pouvons toucher. Elle est *très précieuse*—et peutêtre capable d'approcher des élémens inassociables, de leur nature.”—“If ever Christians reunite, it seems likely that the impulse must start from the English Church. Presbyterianism was of French workmanship, and consequently an exaggerated work. The English Church, which touches us on the one hand, touches on the other hand those whom we cannot touch. She is very precious, and perhaps capable of reconciling elements inassociable from their nature.” If a French Romanist could write thus sixty years ago of the English Church in her *lethargy* and *apathy*, of what may she not be capable *now*, with her *reinvigorated* Catholic life? But Romanism of the modern type cannot find words too bitterly contemptuous to hurl at her. Dr. Manning has not only scorned her as semi-Christian, but positively accused her of being “the cause and spring of the existence” of English infidelity. (See his letter to Dr. Pusey in 1865.) A very different estimate this from De Maistre's, who was reared amidst strong Romanist and French prejudices against the English Church. And Dr. Manning was once an Anglican Archdeacon. The

cause of Catholic reunion is near to every Christian heart, and the one great bar to unity is the centralising autocracy of the Roman Pontiff. What can be weaker or more dangerous than for one brought up in freedom from such a despotic yoke to desert liberty for tyranny? How can an English Churchman for a moment dally with the idea of submitting his faith and conscience to a yoke which our fathers cast off as too grievous to be borne? I have felt it my duty to speak plainly on this subject. I pray that I may never by thought, word, or deed foster a spirit of disunion, and I desire to think of all, Romanists and Protestants alike, with the utmost charity. May God in His own good Providence restore us all to the Unity of the Spirit and the bond of Peace!

“Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.”—GAL. v. 1.

The liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free; what is it? Man sinned. The GOD-MAN took our nature upon Him, and died upon the Cross, that *we* being fast bound in misery and iron—that *we* being fettered in the bondage of sin and Satan—might become God’s freemen—might receive the glorious liberty of God’s citizenship, as heirs of the Heavenly Kingdom—*sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty.**

* II. Cor. vi. 18.

The Kingdom of God was set up upon this earth of ours by Christ and His Apostles ; a vast spiritual corporation was inaugurated by the power of the Holy Ghost, which was to continue until the end of the world. Men are admitted into this spiritual corporation by Holy Baptism, wherein God, the Holy Ghost, *by* and *through* the outward sign of water, sows the seeds of eternal life in our hearts. The seeds of life thus sown are matured and nourished in the members of Christ (for to be such is the high privilege of the members of the visible corporation which Christ founded on earth) *by* and *through* the *mysterious union* of Christ and His members, which is brought about in the partaking of the *most Holy and Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood*. This Holy Corporation, then, in which we taste to the full that glorious liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free —this visible organisation which the Redeemer left on earth as a standing witness to His work and office must have a *name*—a well-known name. A belief in its existence *must* be a *necessary article* of our *Faith*. And so it is. We call this visible corporation which Christ left on earth the Holy Catholic Church.

I believe in *one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church*. I believe that there is on earth a visible organisation of Christians, *Catholic* in doctrine, or in other words, holding the doctrine taught *always*,

*everywhere, and by all authoritative teachers** in the days of pure and primitive faith ; *Apostolic* in orders and discipline, or, in other words, ruled by a ministry of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, who trace their authority by an *unbroken line of descent* to the Apostles of Jesus. This Holy Catholic Church, officered and organised by the successors of the Apostles, is God's instrument for subduing the world to Christ. Turn we back for a moment to the pure days of Primitive Faith.

The noble army of martyrs, a Bishop of Smyrna, like S. Polycarp, a Bishop of Antioch, like S. Ignatius, a Bishop of Carthage, like S. Cyprian, noted alike for his resistance to the early developing arrogance of the then Bishop of Rome† and for his martyrdom

* Cf. Vincentius Lirinensis. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*

† S. Cyprian is a difficulty to the Romanists. As a martyr and confessor of the Faith he was held in high honour by the Roman people, but his writings, as distinctly directed against Papal despotism, were placed under the ban by Pope Gelasius. S. Cyprian and Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, opposed Pope Stephen very firmly upon the question of the re-baptism of heretics, and although S. Cyprian was in the wrong on this special point, he maintained Catholic order in denying the right of the Roman Bishop to dictate to other Bishops and National Churches in matters of doctrine. It became necessary to Papalise the writings of so honoured a saint, and so in a letter of Pope Pelagius II. appears a quotation from S. Cyprian, containing a strong pro-Papal passage :—“ How can he believe himself to be in the Church who forsakes the chair of S. Peter ? ” It is needless to add that S. Cyprian *never wrote these words*. They have been cited by Roman authors time after time to serve their purpose, though they contradict S. Cyprian's own words on the *unity and equality of the Episcopate as a whole* a few lines later on in the same treatise. At last, Dr.

for the Catholic Faith,—such were the men who destroyed Paganism, and won the glorious triumph of Christendom, even as it now is. But even in those early days there were heresies and schisms and perils amongst false brethren. Then, as now, the Catholic Church had to battle against error, the smooth words of the heretic having *war in his heart*, were more dangerous foes than the cord, the stake, and the rack.

How were these dangers to be crushed? How was the Church to vindicate the Catholic Faith? God left her not defenceless, dear brethren. The Apostles met in council to decide controverted points, and God the Holy Ghost guided them to a true decision.* So with their successors the Bishops of the Church. God would never suffer the whole of the Church to be in error. The decision of the Bishops of the Church as a collective body—this decision being afterwards ratified and endorsed by the acceptance of the rank and file of Christendom—is a *true* decision, a determination which God will not permit to err. Thus the Bishops of the Church decided against Arius, who denied our Lord's God-Head, and in so doing drew up the Nicene Creed, which we accept as an *absolutely true confession of our*

Hergenröther, a German Vaticanist, has had to confess that the interpolation is spurious. Cf. his "Anti-Janus," p. 149. *Habemus confitentum reum!*

* Acts xv.

faith.* In like manner other heresies were crushed. The first four General Councils of the Catholic Church guarded the true faith by unerring decisions against different forms of error. The first seven centuries of Christianity saw the Catholic Faith thus firmly maintained, and the Canon of Scripture settled by the voice of the Catholic Church expressed in her Councils. But this blessed period of a united

* The Ecumenical Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, has been made to minister to Papal claims by foisting forged Canons amongst its true ones. About a century after the Nicene Council, a priest of the North African Church was degraded by his Bishop for misconduct. The Bishop of the world's capital in those days possessed considerable ecclesiastical jurisdiction as Primate of Italy, and so the condemned priest came to Rome and asked Pope Zosimus to interfere in his behalf. The North African Church, lying outside the Papal jurisdiction, held three Councils to protest against this interference. Zosimus alleged a Canon of the Nicene Council in support of his right to interfere. But the African Bishops were too acute to be deceived. The Canon quoted by the Pope was the Canon of a local Council, which neither Easterns nor Africans accepted as binding. They produced their *authentic* copy of the Nicene Canons, and administered a stern rebuke to the Pope for his unwarrantable interference. But still the local Canon of Sardica was used by the Popes as if it were Nicene, and an artful forger strengthened the Roman case by two false letters written in the name of S. Athanasius, purporting to ask for the *true* copy of the Nicene Canons, "doubtless preserved at Rome," and declaring in unmeasured terms the doctrine of Papal Supremacy. Melchior Canus employed these forgeries in the sixteenth century to bolster up Papal claims, while the Benedictine editors of 1698 (staunch Romanists) said "that they bore not even a *shadow* of genuineness." But this is not all. What a grand *coup* it would be to find these *Papalising* Nicene Canons in MS.? Pius IV. sends a Jesuit to search, and, lo! in the sixteenth century a MS. purporting to be the long lost Canons, is conveniently disinterred! How any Romanist can believe such forgeries is a mental problem. Bishop Hefele, one of the most learned Roman Catholic Bishops of Germany, says the so-called Canons are "thoroughly and utterly false." And yet Liguori calmly quotes them to prove Papal Infallibility, in the face of the genuine Canons of Nicæa which we possess, in the face of *truth, common sense, and history*.

Christendom came to an end. *It must needs be that offences come ; but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh.** The Eastern Church, whose chief Bishop was the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Western Church, whose chief Bishop was the Patriarch of Rome, became separated from one another from trivial and unworthy causes.† Thus the possibility of a General Council of the whole Episcopate was, for the time, removed, and we know not whether God's Providence will ever permit the whole Church to meet in Council again. It is enough for us that, so far as the definition of *necessary* truth goes, the Church, having once defined the Catholic Faith, need not ever meet to define it again.

* S. Matthew xviii. 7.

† The unauthorized addition of "Filioque" to the Nicene Creed, as expressing the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father "and the Son," was made the ostensible cause of separation. The Easterns declined to admit any alteration in the wording of a Creed, however theologically accurate, without the authority of a General Council. The Pope tried to enforce the added words with a high hand. The Eastern view of the Pope's position was that sanctioned by the Canon of Chalcedon, which gave the Pope the position of Senior Bishop of Christendom, but carefully fenced off the idea that he was its despotic Head. Consequently, they resisted this effort of Papal tyranny, and a breach was thus caused between East and West, which has never since been healed. Strange to say, one of the indirect results of the late Vatican Council has been a real and earnest effort to undo this mischief. Dr. Döllinger and the Alt-Catholics, together with some prominent English Churchmen, met representatives of the Eastern Church in conference at Bonn, upon the common basis of resistance to Vaticanism. A concordat was drawn up, in which the verbal differences of centuries were healed most marvellously, and the immediate future may shew us Eastern, Anglican, and Western Catholics presenting a united front against the Papacy.

A General Council of the future *may* be God's way to unity ; but this we know not. God's Ways are not as ours. Meanwhile, so-called General Councils convened by the See of Rome, such as the Lateran Councils, the Council of Trent, and the Vatican Council of 1870, *have no claim whatever* to be the *true* voice of the Church of Christ, because they only represent a *part* of Christendom.

But I anticipate. I desire to trace briefly the further consequences of the quarrel between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople. The National Churches of Spain, France, and Germany, and in a lesser degree the then Church of England,* regarded the Bishop of Rome as the senior and President of the Bishops of Western Europe. Rome was, and had been, the capital of the world, and the Roman Bishop gained power and authority from this fact. Churches began to invoke him as arbitrator, and gradually the authority of the individual National Churches became weaker and weaker, and the Bishops little by little surrendered their rights into

* National Church feeling was always strong in England. Pope Gregory I., a true Primate of Christendom, fostered this feeling by sanctioning a National Prayer Book, which was the forerunner of the Sarum Missal, and its vernacular adaptation, our present Book of Common Prayer. English feeling was afterwards outraged by the Popes, and the tie loosened between England and Rome. Englishmen did not forget that the Pope excommunicated the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Barons for extorting Magna Charta from King John, and the whole tendency of mediæval English history shews the growing distaste of the people for Papal absolutism.

the hands of the Bishop of Rome.* Thus grew by slow degrees the stupendous fabric of the mediæval Papacy, till Pope Hildebrand, and after him Pope Innocent III., crowned its power by the humiliating submission of Emperors and Kings to the behests of the Roman Pontiff.†

Alongside of the gradually growing spiritual supremacy of the Roman Bishops was a corresponding doctrinal development—a melancholy growth of *deviation* from the Catholic Faith of the undivided and Primitive Church. This deviation from the Primitive Faith, which gradually overspread the

* At the Council of Basle, A.D. 1438, a Roman Cardinal spoke thus: "What at this day were Bishops, but a sort of 'shadow?' For whereas in the Primitive Church, the chief powers were with Bishops, now have they come to this, that in dress only and revenue they surpass Presbyters." Pope Nicholas V. spoke as plainly: "The Roman Pontiffs, it seems to me, extended their skirts too far, in that they left no jurisdiction to the other Bishops." Thus we hear voices from the very heart and core of the Papal Despotism some four centuries ago, testifying to the ancient co-equality and co-ordinate authority of the Bishops of Christendom. Matters are worse now. The little finger of Pio Nono is thicker than the loins of Nicholas V. The Roman Catholic Episcopate has fallen to an unparalleled depth of subserviency since the Council of Basle.

† I do not mean to undervalue the noble stand for truth and justice made by some of the Popes against despotic power, instances where the conduct of the Bishops of Rome finds its true parallel in the glorious firmness of S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, in his treatment of the Emperor Theodosius. The Church must speak of God's testimonies even before Kings and be not ashamed, as our seven Bishops did in resistance to King James II. But Hildebrand's treatment of the Emperor at Canossa, and the dealings of Innocent III. with King John, not to mention other instances, shew the Popes as Lords over God's heritage, and as claiming an allegiance from the world utterly incompatible with the principles of ordinary civil government. However jealous we may be lest the State encroach on the Church, there are still *some* dues to be rendered to Cæsar.

Western Church, is called Papalism or Romanism. Starting from the Papal Supremacy,* or the idea that the Roman Bishop was to rule Christendom with despotic power, Romanism, with its doctrine of Indulgences and virtual selling of the Holy Communion† (a practice lamented bitterly by a Roman-

* The idea of Primacy and Supremacy, as applied to the Bishop of Rome, are vastly divergent. Without prejudicing the co-ordinate authority of the Episcopate, the Bishops of National Churches have chosen a presiding Bishop, as a committee chooses a chairman. The American Church elects its presiding Bishop without any reference to a particular See, but this Primacy is generally local, as the Primacy of the South African Church is attached to the See of Capetown, or the Primacy, or rather Patriarchate, of the whole Anglican Church to Canterbury. So in the Ancient Church, the Bishop of Constantinople was Primate and Patriarch of the East, and the Bishop of Rome Primate of the West. The antiquity or past historic glories of a See may give a hereditary Primacy to its occupant. The Bishop of the first city in the world had this Primacy readily accorded to him in the Ancient Church by the Council of Chalcedon, which Anglicans and Easterns acknowledge. His position as then defined towards the Patriarch of Constantinople was analogous to the relation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of York, not a Primacy of jurisdiction but of seniority. Such a Primacy as this, Anglicans and Easterns would readily concede to the Pope, notwithstanding the injuries they have suffered from the Papacy, when the Latin Churches have purged themselves from the apostacy of Romanism. Archbishop Wake, of Canterbury, writing to Du Pin, an eminent French Roman Catholic, concerning a reunion of the English and French Churches, admits a limited Primacy, and so does Balsamon, a famous Greek canonist of the twelfth century. The best analogy I can offer to shew the true position of the Bishop of Rome, in a reunited Christendom, purged from Papalism, is the position the Archbishop of Canterbury occupies in the Pan-Anglican Synod. By virtue of his office he presides as *primus inter pares*, but he has no actual jurisdiction in the Colonial, Scottish, Irish, or American Churches. But the absolute despotism of the Modern Papacy, with its absorbing of the rights of the Episcopate, is a monstrous blot on Christendom which must necessarily be effaced as the first step to reunion.

† The Pope's authority was imagined to influence the state of departed souls in relaxation of their purgatorial torments. The super-abundant virtues of the saints were supposed to be stored in a treasure-

ist Bishop), gradually overlaid the Catholic Faith in Western Europe, until the primitive truth and beauty of the Catholic religion of S. Athanasius and S. Augustine was well-nigh obscured and lost. I

house, of which the Pope had the key. Out of this store it was supposed he could supply virtues or merits to those who lacked them. Ignorant monks hawked about the Pope's Pardons or Indulgences for money, until Europe was aflame at the scandal, and the Council of Trent had to check its worst abuses. But let anyone examine the "Crown of Jesus," a popular Romanist manual, and they will see that Indulgences still exist. To this day in Spain you can purchase the Indulgence of the Crusade (originally given to the warriors of the Cross in Palestine), and enjoy its relaxation for five pence! Listen to the words of a Franciscan monk, one Berthold, on the Indulgence-mongers of the thirteenth century: "They are called 'Penny Preachers,' and are among the favourite servants of the Devil. He goes forth among the simple people, and he says he has power from the Pope to take away all thy sins for a halfpenny. He crowns the Devil daily with many thousand souls" (Berthold, "Deutsch Pred.", p. 384). Strong language this, to proceed from a devoted Roman Catholic. Voices from within testify more clearly than voices from without. So again with regard to the sale of Masses, which, however, it may be explained, seems a simoniacal celebration of the Holy Communion for money. Listen to the words of an ultramontane Bishop on this abuse: "*Our Church is full and overfull of altars, masses, and sacrifices. For at this day so many masses are said for gain, or custom, or complaisance, or to cover wickedness, that both among priests and people the Holy Body of the Lord is now held cheap; and now through custom it has indurated that a Mass, priced at three or four deniers, or one shilling, is bought and sold by a blind people and wicked simoniacal priests*" (Alvarus Pelagius de Planctu Ecclesiae, ii., 5). I should be loth to charge this shameful scandal upon the Latin Church as a whole, and I prefer to use the words of a Papal official to describe it. Romanist admissions are of far greater value than mere statements of Protestant controversialists, which, as a rule, overreach themselves. I will cite one more modern Roman Catholic testimony to prove that these abuses linger at Rome yet. "If in Rome, clergymen (the so-called preti di piazza), stand in the public places till someone hires them for a Mass, this gives no more offence than the sale of Indulgence-bills, and so the Roman commissionaires, after shewing visitors the sights of the place, finally point out this spectacle to them." Well may Dr. Newman say, "*There is a great deal of Roman 'Malaria' at the foot of the Rock of S. Peter.*"—Letter to Duke of Norfolk.

would not deny or disparage the saintliness of the many holy souls who in those times and since then have clung to Romanist beliefs and doctrines, and held them as overlaying additions to the Catholic Faith of the early Church. God knows his own people; but remember that the saints of the middle ages, and the holy men and women of modern Romanism, are saints in *spite* of their Romanism, and *not* because of it. At the Reformation, the English Church bethought her of the *liberty wherewith Christ had made her free*, and rejected the supremacy of the Pope, and those additions of false teaching to the Catholic Faith which we commonly call Romanism. Evil instruments wrought in this case God's purposes, but for all that God's purposes *were* wrought out, with the result that the Anglican Church returned to the pure Primitive Faith of the General Councils, and the undivided Catholic Church. Our enemies tell us we are a Protestant sect some 300 years old, made by King Henry VIII.* But to use a familiar illus-

* Convocation, the lawful Provincial Synod of the English Church, solemnly repudiated the Papal Supremacy on the 11th February, 1531, under the presidency of Archbishop Wareham, a prelate utterly alien to a sweeping *doctrinal* Reformation. In 1538 Convocation appealed to a future General Council for the reformation of palpable abuses. This appeal was no novelty, for Archbishop Chichele in 1427 had appealed to a General Council against Pope Martin V. The Parliament, the Universities, and six great monasteries endorsed and accepted the action of Convocation. Quite apart from the question of the King's divorce, popular feeling led England to renounce the Papal tyranny. We will not dwell upon the evil brought by the King's avarice and Cranmer's weakness, or the dark days of the two succeeding reigns. The Church was endangered, but she weathered the storm,

tration, King Henry VIII. no more *made* the English Church what it is, than a man could be said to *make* a

and for the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign Romanists did not question her Catholicity. Pius IV. professed his readiness to accept the Anglican Prayer Book. Cardinal Manning admits that at this period of her reign Queen Elizabeth was "both *de jure* and *de facto* a subject of the Catholic Church" (Vatican Decrees, p. 89), an admission which to my mind conveys a great deal, namely, that the Papacy was ready to accept the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and the Anglican Reformation of mediæval abuses, and trust to the future for reducing England again to subservience, or, in other words, that up to the date of the Queen's excommunication, Rome could not help admitting the Catholicity of the English Church, notwithstanding its rejection of Papal Supremacy. So thought the English Papalists of that date. They attended the Reformed Mass in their parish churches, they owned the allegiance of the Elizabethan Bishops until April 27, 1570. Then by the infamous bull of Pius V., Queen Elizabeth was excommunicated as a heretic, and denounced as a usurper, and the English Papalists were bidden to forsake the altars of their Mother Church and set up an Anglo-Romanist schism. This insignificant body, with no historical connection with the old English Church, had to wait till 1598 before the Pope sent a Rural Dean to govern it. In 1623 they had Vicars-Apostolic, and so they continued for years an alien and schismatic body, until Pius IX. insulted the Anglo-Catholic Church by appointing a schismatic Episcopate in England, whose present head is the titular "Archbishop of Westminster." No wonder Anglo-Romanists are so bitter against us. They have no history to fall back on. They have no connection whatever with the Church of S. Chad, S. Anselm, Langton, and Chichele. They do not even use the Sarum Missal, the ancient pre-Reformation Service Book of the English Church. Supposing that Vaticanism was overthrown, and that we formed a reunion with the National Churches of Catholic Europe, what would become of the Anglo-Romanists? Their religious position would be schismatic in the eyes of the Catholic Churches of East and West. *Hinc illæ lacrimæ.* Hence the bitter and contemptuous expressions of Cardinal Manning, Mgr. Capel, Bishop Ullathorne, &c., with regard to the English Church. We have seen how Count de Maistre viewed us. In 1718 formal proposals of reunion came to Archbishop Wake, of Canterbury, from Du Pin and other learned doctors of the Catholic Church of France. Cardinal de Noailles was also concerned in these negotiations. The French Roman Catholic theologians seem almost to have anticipated the Alt-Catholics in the moderation of their views, for they acknowledged our Orders, the value of our Eucharistic office, and the Catholicity of our Church in the fullest possible terms. Alas! these bright hopes of reunion were crushed by the intrigues of Jesuits and politicians.

statue by defacing its proportions with the rude blows of an unskilled hand. The plain truth is, God used a wicked King to work His will, and through a fiery trial and fierce tempest it pleased Him to restore the English Church to the Catholic Faith and purge it of Romanism. At this date Romanism, although overlaying the Catholic Faith in the Western Church, was not actually embodied in the Creeds of the Roman obedience. Just as the Greek and Russian Churches *now* stand committed as a body to no actual error of faith, although there are certain opinions and practices taught amongst them that need a measure of reformation, so, before the fatal Council of Trent, scarcely 300 years ago, Romanism might have been purged from the Western Branch of the Church. But, no; certain definite opinions of Romanism were then made Articles of Faith. The modern Roman Catholic Church dates from that fatal Council. Unauthorised developments of doctrine were then first added to the Faith as being necessary to salvation, and the wall of partition which separates Rome from primitive Catholicity was then first *definitely built up.** Since that first

* The Council of Trent did much good until it fell into the hands of Lainez and the Jesuits. At first its proceedings were marked with moderation and a real desire to reform abuses. I would not for one moment disparage the work done at Trent, in taking away some grievous scandals from the Church. But the *fons et origo mali* was not touched, nay, more, the Papacy was strengthened by the *distinct conciliar* affirmation of Romanist doctrines. A belief in Purgatory,

downward step others have, alas ! been taken. The taste for manufacturing dogmas is progressive. Pious opinions have been stereotyped into authorised doctrines *twice* within the last thirty years. In 1854 the Roman Church added to the Creed of Romanism the unscriptural and uncatholic doctrine that the Blessed Virgin Mary was born without original sin, and this in defiance of the opinion of many Roman Catholic Bishops.*

Indulgences, Transubstantiation, and above all the Papal Supremacy was added to the *de fide credenda* of the Roman Church. The Creed of Pius IV., embodying these novelties, is (or was) the profession of faith of every modern Romanist until the recent decisions took place, which have robbed Romanism of even the antiquity of 300 years, and made the new Roman faith a thing of yesterday. The Council of Trent was the beginning of the Vatican ending, if we can call that an ending which really marks a fresh epoch in doctrinal development. As such it was indeed fatal, and though Dr. Pusey and Bishop Forbes have indicated methods whereby its actual language might be harmonised with Catholic doctrine, its main facts and issues are *unalterably* disastrous.

* Melchior Canus, one of the great Roman Catholic theologians who took part in the Council of Trent, says: "All the *Saints who speak of it, say with one voice that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin.*" Melchior Canus clearly states the Catholic doctrine in words of plain, simple truth. To begin with, there is not a trace or a hint to be found in Holy Writ in support of the idea that S. Mary was born free from the stain of Adam's transgression. She was "highly favoured" and "full of grace," so that the consequences of her birth in sin were not wrought out in her to the injury of her transcendent purity and holiness. Christ was born of a *pure* Virgin, for the All-pure could not be brought forth from the impure, or the clean from the unclean; but whatever view we may hold with regard to the singular grace and beauty of that holiness which God wrought in her whom He dignified with being the Mother of the Incarnate Word, she was born, like the rest of us, in original sin. In one passage S. Augustine says "he wishes no question to be made, when sins are treated of, concerning the Holy Virgin Mary," for how do we know what grace to CONQUER sin may have been bestowed on her who was found meet to conceive Him, of Whom it is CERTAIN that He had no sin? (De Nat.

In 1870 a *so-called* General Council of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy was summoned by the Pope, and the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was affirmed. We can remember what a terrible blow this new doctrine was to God-fearing Roman Catholics who opposed it, and how the old Catholics of Germany manfully stood in opposition to this latest Roman development, and still stand as a *Catholic* Church severed from Rome, in friendly intercourse with the Anglican and Eastern

et Grat., c. 36.) Here evidently he refers to the saintliness of S. Mary, which we may believe guarded her from *actual* sin, and *not* to her *sinless birth*. S. Augustine clearly shews this, when he distinctly says "*the Blessed Virgin was conceived and born in sin*," in his work *Cont. Julian, Pelag.* iv. 122; v. 15; vi. 22, and in three other passages. S. Anselm, of Canterbury, says: "*The Virgin herself was conceived in iniquity, and with original sin was she born*" (*Cur Deus homo.* ii. 16). S. Peter Damiani, the cherished friend of Hildebrand, says: "*From that very flesh of the Virgin, WHICH WAS CONCEIVED OF SIN, the Flesh came forth without sin, Which abolished the sins of the flesh*" (*Opuse.* vi. 19). Durandus (A.D. 1320) says of the Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary: "*It may be celebrated, not because she was conceived (since she was conceived in sin), but because the Mother of the Lord was conceived.*" This, too, was the doctrine of P. Lombard, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventura, and many others. Beside these authorities there is the learned and elaborate work of Cardinal Turrecremata in disproof of the novel doctrine, which is conclusive and unanswerable. The new doctrine was taken up by the University of Paris and the Franciscan order. The Dominicans upheld the true doctrine. The matter was left as a pious opinion till the Jesuit *entourage* of Pio Nono procured its dogmatic definition by him in 1854. Previous to this the opinions of the Roman Catholic Episcopate were invited on the matter. Many were silent, many wrote in affirmation, but notwithstanding the subserviency of the Roman Catholic Bishops as the Pope's deputies, there were no less than fifty of the most learned and able Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops who objected or demurred to the erection of this disputed doctrine into a dogma of faith. Of course, their voices were not heeded, and the new dogma, Christ-dishonouring, and uncatholic as it is, is now part of the Roman Catholic Creed.

Churches. This new dogma, and the Vatican decrees which Mr. Gladstone has so forcibly exposed, have really made Romanism a new religious body, *scarcely seven years old*,* and whether we accept the laboured explanation of Dr. Newman, or the outspoken language of Dr. Manning, the result is the same.†

* This sermon was preached in 1877.

† We cannot fail to accord the utmost respect and reverence to whatever falls from the pen of Dr. Newman. To use the words of an Anglo-Romish periodical, his "has been the mind and tongue to shape and express the English Catholic position in the many controversies that have arisen" (*Month*, Dec., 1874). But though some of his co-religionists think thus highly of his defence of their views, the Ultra-Vatican party have bitterly attacked him for his moderation. Before the Council Dr. Newman strongly deprecated the definition of Infallibility, and severely stigmatised the Ultra-Vaticanists. Writing to Bishop Ullathorne before the definition, he used these significant words: "Why should an insolent and aggressive faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?" After the definition, he took a "minimist" view of its meaning and effects in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, which, without satisfying the opponents of the dogma, seriously offended its promoters. The *Voce della Verita*, the Roman Jesuit newspaper, complained of the line he took, and the *Dublin Review*, the Ultra organ of Anglo-Romanism, commented upon him in most severe terms. The "aggressive and insolent faction" have long memories, and Dr. Newman could not expect them to allow him to rest in peace. The leader of this "faction" was Cardinal Manning. The Jesuits at Rome presented him with a testimonial in remembrance of his services in procuring the definition of Infallibility. The Jesuits knew well who had best helped forward their darling project, and we may take their judgment upon the fact that Cardinal Manning was the Ultramontane leader. Just before the Council he published "Petri Privilegium," a clever attempt to prove Infallibility from history, but, it is needless to add, an utter failure. He took the same tone in his explanation of the Vatican decree. We must admire a certain outspokenness in his tone, though his crude assertions and unwarrantable handling of history remove both the "Petri Privilegium" and his answer to Mr. Gladstone from the region of argument to that of an utter and categorical denial of the position he assumed. His character is summed up with singular accuracy in the words of one of the Cardinals who *voted with him* for Infallibility, but evidently disliked his intense dogmatism and his

The Infallibility of the Pope, based as it is upon *admitted* forgeries, and founded upon *manifest* perversions of history, is the most *uncatholic* and *incredible* dogma ever presented to the common sense of mankind.* There are yet other pious opinions

method of pushing his foregone conclusions in the teeth of truth and reason. The Cardinal says: "The persistence of the Archbishop of Westminster was, perhaps, the logical result of his own antecedents. He did not appreciate the good effects of a moderate degree of liberty, neither did he understand the dangers arising from the excessive authority exercised by united Catholicism. He was enamoured of the principle of authority as a slave adores the idea of liberty, and the want of discrimination and of real Catholic perceptions in his dealings with the Council was a matter of reproach to him even by the most faithful and devout clergy of Rome."

* The doctrine of Papal Infallibility is *uncatholic*, because it supplants the Catholic doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church, or, in other words, the doctrine that the continued presence of God the Holy Ghost with the Church will (i.) never suffer the whole Church to be in error; (ii.) guide the deliberations of a lawful General Council; (iii.) guide the assent of Christendom to the result of their deliberations; and (iv.) preserve the Church from new dogmas and from doctrinal development. This doctrine is *incredible*, because it entails a reversal of the verdict of Church history (i.) with regard to the question of Papal Supremacy as a whole; (ii.) with regard to the errors and contradictions of the Popes in person. It is, moreover, based upon admitted forgeries. Dr. Newman (p. 30, Letter to the Duke of Norfolk), in speaking of the means whereby Church authority became concentrated in the hands of the Pope, says that "Clergy and people at a distance were obstinate in sheltering themselves under the majesty of Rome, even to the imposing forgeries on the world and on the Pope in justification of their proceedings." This, of course, is a one-sided view of a question which the "late learned and lamented Père Gratry," as Bishop Ullathorne called him, described as being "*totallement gangrenée par la fraude.*" A question utterly gangrened with fraud! These are strong words for a learned and devout French Roman Catholic priest and member of the Oratory to use. But they are not beside the mark. I have shown above how the Papalists have fraudulently made insertions in S. Cyprian's works, and how they have treated the Nicene Canons. SS. Cyril, Augustine, and Irenæus have been similarly treated. But these are as *nothing* compared with the pseudo-Isidorian decretals. A ninth century forger produced fictitious letters, *supposed* to be written by S. Peter, S. Clement, Anacletus, and

other early Bishops of Rome, advocating extreme Papal claims. For centuries these forgeries were quoted in favour of Papal despotism. At last Bellarmine gave them up, and Pope Pius VI. judged them worthy of the flames. But they had, alas! *done their work effectually*. They had been believed for eight centuries, and, though tardily disowned, *the fabric built on them remains to this day*. It is furthermore incredible that the Roman Bishop in the nineteenth century should have an authority over the Christian world unknown to S. Peter or any other Apostle, and utterly contrary to the letter and spirit of Holy Writ. If the text “Thou art Peter,” &c., be taken as the foundation of the Infallibility of the Popes, and if “this rock” be taken to mean the person and ministry of S. Peter, the words must be taken to mean *his ministry as a whole, with all its details*, and with no distinction between *ex cathedrā* utterances and those *not ex cathedrā*. The text would then prove *too much*, even for Cardinal Manning’s ideas. But S. Peter knew nothing about his own presumed infallibility, judging from his own Epistles which we possess. S. Paul would certainly not have withheld him to the face, and blamed him for maladministration, had he been the Infallible Despot of Christendom. Besides all of which, this picking out and distorting the plain meaning of three isolated texts, as the Infallibilists do, is utterly contrary to the breadth and truth of Christianity, and, moreover, is directly alien to the mind of the early Church. The break which the Infallibility dogma has made in the historical continuity of the Roman Church is complete and thorough. The Vatican Council officially added the title “Roman” to the old title of the “Catholic Church” claimed by the Latin Church before 1870. When I first saw the phrase “the Holy Catholic *Roman* Church,” as used in a letter by a Roman Catholic priest, writing since 1870, it made one realise how complete was the breach of connection between the “Holy Catholic Roman Church” of the Vatican Council, and the “Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church” of the Nicene Council, A.D. 325. It need hardly be said that Cardinal Manning’s Ultra-Vaticanism is utterly at variance with historical facts, and when we come to Dr. Newman, we find him compelled, by the exigencies of his position, to take a novel and untenable view of the relation of dogma and history. With regard to the Immaculate Conception in 1854, and Papal Infallibility in 1870, Dr. Newman admits that an opponent might say, with regard to either definition, “that antecedently to the event (*i.e.*, the decision), it might appear that there were *no sufficient historical* grounds in behalf of either of them for the purpose of converting a doctrine into a dogma, and making it a portion of the Catholic Creed. This adverse anticipation was proved to be a *mistake*, by the *fact of the definition being made*” (Letter to Duke of Norfolk, p. 107). This language seems very like an *utter subordination* of historical facts to Papal exigencies. The definition *was made*, and therefore the adverse anticipations of its historical accuracy *must* go to the wall. The plain verdict of *past* facts must bow before the *present* teaching of the Vatican. This caused the Old Catholic movement.

waiting to be erected into dogmas for all we know. Language has been used by Romanist divines with regard to the relations between the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Trinity, and with regard to her Co-Presence in the Holy Communion, which Roman Catholics themselves admit to verge on blasphemy. S. Mary is exalted as Co-Redeemer with her Son,

Dr. Döllinger, the first theologian and Church historian of the Roman Communion, could not conscientiously subvert history and consent to an irregular breach of the present with the past. Dr. Newman, speaking of the Old Catholic leaders, says : “ *I will never say a word of my own against those learned and distinguished men. It is a tragical event both for them and for us that they have left us. It robs us of a great prestige : they have left none to take their place* ” (Letter to Duke of Norfolk, p. 104). After this impartial verdict, we can afford to estimate, at their worth, the Vaticanist efforts to throw discredit on Dr. Döllinger and his co-workers. Without entering into details with regard to the violence done to history in creating this false floating opinion of Papal Infallibility into a dogma, we may investigate the contrary opinion of the English and Irish Roman Catholic Bishops in past years. Bishop Baines, an eminent Anglo-Romanist Bishop, wrote in 1822 : “ Bellarmine and some other divines, chiefly Italians, have believed the Pope infallible when proposing, *ex cathedrâ*, an Article of Faith. But in England and Ireland I do not believe that any Catholic maintains the infallibility of the Pope.” Bishop Doyle gave the same testimony before the House of Commons. In Article xi. of the Pastoral Address issued by the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, dated January 25th, 1826, are these words : “ They declare on oath their belief that it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, neither are they thereby required to believe that the Pope is infallible.” In an address signed in 1788 by all the English Vicars-Apostolic, and by 241 English Roman Catholic priests and all the Roman Catholic laity of note, is an important statement to the effect that those who signed it “ *acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope*.” This break with history is too recent to be explained away. We need not tarry with the sad details of the Council of 1870 ; we need not reap up the scandalous dealings that disintegrated the minority and checked the freedom of debate. The story is too well known. We need not tarry with the bearing of the Council upon civil allegiance. Mr. Gladstone’s exposure has been thorough, and his answers have only made his original position clearer to the world.

and though as yet the Romanists do not crystallise these floating opinions into dogmas of faith, what guarantee have we that in time to come they will not do so?

The Immaculate Conception is a doctrine terrible enough on the pathway to worship of the Virgin, and it is possible that opinion may go yet further in the virtual dethronement of Christ our Saviour by His Mother.*

* An anonymous writer in the *E. P. Herald*, of February 6th, charges me with making statements "distinctly untrue" with regard to the *doctrine* of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary. The writer in question seems singularly devoid of theological perception, and he seems to have overlooked my careful distinction between the *authoritative dogma* of the Roman Catholic Church and the "pious opinions" held with a *quasi* authority, or, at all events, not *distinctly* forbidden, within its pale. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception, though unscriptural and uncatholic, is not Virgin worship, *per se*, but is the pathway to it. Mariolatry, or the worship of S. Mary with the *Latria*, or worship due to God, is not as yet a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, and I pray God it never may be. But though the Roman Catholic Church is clear from this charge, so far as its *authoritative* teaching goes, I am bound to state that the "pious opinions" held by certain divines with regard to the Blessed Virgin Mary and *unforbidden* by *authority*, do distinctly involve Mariolatry, and the fear is not unreasonable that the rapid dogmatic development of the last thirty years may involve the Roman Catholic Church *de fide* in the grievous errors now taught only *de più opinione*. When the Roman Catholic Bishops sent their opinions to the Pope on the Immaculate Conception, the Bishop of Cariarti wrote and prayed to the Pope to command that "no one should dare hereafter to suspect the Immaculate Conception of their *Co-Redeemer*." The Bishop of Asti wrote of our Lord's "pure Mother the *Co-Redemptrix of the World*." The Bishop of Almeria calls her "Authoress of everlasting Salvation." When we think of the Litany Invocation, "O God the Son, *Redeemer of the World*," the language of these Romanist Bishops seems sheer Mariolatry. There is a Roman Catholic book called the "Glories of Mary," which has received the sanction of authority. In it are these words addressed to the Blessed Virgin Mary: "You have over God the Authority of a mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the *most obstinate sinners*."

All these recent doctrinal developments are more or less traceable in their active working to one Order within the Roman Catholic Church—the Order of Jesuits. The Jesuit marches to his appointed end with a pitiless accuracy of course. No question of morals or right and wrong will stop his path or prove

Again, a Roman Catholic writer says: “The Blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God Himself is subject to her in respect of the manhood which He assumed from her” (Bern. Sen. Serm. 61). What terrible words are these, and how likely to frighten reverent minds into Nestorianism, or a denial that the Blessed Virgin Mary was the Mother of the God-Man! Such language as this tends to obscure the truth that God took our nature upon Him in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, and tempts people to object to the term *θεότοκος* as applied to the Blessed Virgin Mary. What a perversion, too, of the plain truth that our Lord’s subjection to His Mother ceased when His true Ministry began. An attempt to *perpetuate* that subjection in the Kingdom of Heaven is Mariolatrous blasphemy. S. Mary, too, is spoken of as the “*Complement of the Trinity*.” “The Father imparts His Infinite Essence to the Son, the Son with the Father communicates the same to the Holy Ghost, but there is no *Fourth Person* to whom the Holy Ghost can pour himself without measure. Mary then gave a *Complement to the Trinity*, in that the Holy Ghost could lighten that desire of communicating Himself by the wonderful affluence of His gifts to Mary” (Salazar in Prov. viii. 23). Romanists are fond of saying that no one can understand the true meaning of the language they employ but themselves, but taken according to plain common sense and grammar Salazar’s words convey Mariolatry. Again, Oswald (Dogmat. Mariologie, p. 177) says: “We maintain a *Co-Presence of Mary* in the Eucharist.” “This is a necessary inference from our Marian theory, and we shrink from no consequence. We are much inclined to believe an essential co-presence of Mary in her whole person, with body and soul, under the sacred species.” I have been severely taken to task by Anglo-Romanists for maintaining that such opinions as these were current in the Roman Catholic Church. I am aware that they obtain readier currency amongst Italians than amongst Anglo-Romanists. I am thankful that as yet such blasphemous speculations are *not part* of the *authorised dogma* of the Roman Catholic Church; but why have they not been condemned? Why did Cornelius à Lapide write, unrebuted, the words: “For as often as we eat the *Flesh of Christ in the Holy Eucharist*, so often do we in it really eat the *Flesh of the Blessed Virgin*” (Com. on Eccl. xxiv. 20). Faber, too, says: “He (our Saviour) vouchsafed at mass to shew to S. Ignatius the *very part of the*

any permanent hindrance to his casuistry. Wise and pious Romanists have dreaded the power of these indefatigable janissaries of the Pope. I do not say that there are not many holy men amongst them, but their principles and mode of action are essentially unscrupulous and wrong.* About 100 years ago,

Host which had once belonged to the substance of Mary" (Faber, "The Precious Blood," pp. 29, 30). I repeat that I do not wish to confuse the teachings of these writers with the Roman Catholic *dogma*, but when they *are not denounced* in their own Communion, and when Cardinal Manning has said of Roman Catholic *Opinions*: "Whatsoever is prevalent in the Church under the eye of its public authority, practised by the people, and *not censured by its pastors*, is at least conformable to faith and innocent in morals" (Pastoral on Reunion of Christendom, p. 65), there is reason for the gravest fear lest this *uncensured* Mariolatry should develop into the authorised *dogma of the Roman Catholic Church*.

* I have been charged with inaccuracy with regard to Pope Clement XIV., and his Brief for the suppression of the Jesuits. I have been presumably corrected by a quotation from "Chambers's Encyclopædia," which is *certainly* a neutral and *probably* an incomplete authority. I decline to quote a different version of the affair as given in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." I decline to avail myself of any mere outside reference, and shall establish my point that the Jesuits were suppressed as *dangerous in Church and State* from the *actual* language of Pope Clement XIV., in his celebrated Brief, "Dominus ac Redemptor Noster." I quote the following passage from the Pope's Brief:—"Dissensions and disputes arose; sometimes concerning the absolute authority assumed by the General of the said Order:—accusations of the gravest nature, and *very detrimental to the peace and tranquillity of the Christian Republic*, have been continually received against the said Order. Philip II., King of Spain, laid before Sixtus V. the reasons of complaint which he had against the excessive privileges of the Society and the form of their government. He demanded that the Society should undergo an Apostolic Visitation. Sixtus V., convinced that these demands of Philip were *just and well-founded*, did without hesitation comply therewith. Complaints and quarrels were multiplied on every side, in some places *dangerous seditions* arose, *tumults, discords, dissensions, scandals*, which weakening, or entirely breaking the bonds of Christian charity, *excited the faithful to all the rage of party hatred and enmities*. Our dearly beloved sons in Christ, the Kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Sicily found themselves reduced to the necessity of *expelling* and *driving* from their States, Kingdoms, and

Pope Clement XIV. solemnly suppressed the Jesuit Order as dangerous in Church and State, a presumably infallible act, which was undone by his presumably infallible successor some years afterwards. So

Provinces these very Companions of Jesus. Having further considered that it was *difficult*, not to say *impossible*, that the Church should *recover a firm and durable peace*, so long as the said Society subsisted ; after a mature deliberation, *we do out of our certain knowledge and the fulness of our Apostolical power suppress and abolish the said Company.*" My own impression is that these forcible words of Pope Clement XIV., uttered as they were in the most deliberate and solemn manner, would have justified more ample language than my simple statement, that the Jesuits were suppressed as *dangerous in Church and State*. But my words convey a meaning quite significant enough, so I do not care to strengthen them. I do not care to quote Protestant writers, lest I be accused of undue bias. Here are words of modern Roman Catholic authorship : "The Jesuit sees the perfection of piety in the renunciation of one's own judgment, the passive surrender of intelligence and will alike to those whom he recognises as his rulers. The sacrifice of one's own understanding to that of another man is, according to the teaching of the Order, the noblest and most acceptable sacrifice a Christian can offer to God. In the Exercises (Exercit. Spirit, pp. 290-321), it is inculcated that if the Church decides anything to be black, which to our eyes looks white, we must say that it is black." With this description of the Order from a Roman Catholic point of view, we may well marvel at the atmosphere of moral paradox that would envelop a holy Jesuit. I think the little injury that Jesuitism was able to work upon a saintly life like that of S. Francis Xavier is one of the most remarkable instances of the singular grace of God in preserving His own in the midst of a moral wilderness. Other members of the Order have been most holy and devoted in spite of their Jesuitry. I refer to a Protestant authority for once. Macaulay's eloquent testimony to the self-denying zeal of the Order (Hist. ii. p. 55) is high praise indeed. But the fears of Melchior Canus, the eminent Roman Catholic theologian (Orlandin Hist. Jes. viii. 1), with regard to the dangerous fundamental principles of the Order have been more than justified by the event. The subjection of every consideration, human and divine, in order to gain an appointed end, makes the working of the Order as non-human as a lifeless piece of machinery. Obedience is commanded by the General, whose obedience in turn is exacted by the Pope, and independently of all other authority, Diocesan or Parochial, the Jesuit marches *over and through* all obstacles, moral or otherwise, to his own end—the subjection of all men to the authority of the Papacy.

the Jesuits exist still, and are bound to proselytise, and, dear brethren, there are Jesuits at work in this Diocese.* This is why as your parish priest I solemnly warn you against their subtle tongues. This is why I have to-night traced out for you the rise and origin of Romanism. This is why I bid you in God's name beware of their hidden leaven. My caution is needed. A Roman priest this last week openly informed me that five or six of our people were under instruction for their reception into Romanism. I cannot bring myself to believe this, but, my dearly beloved in Christ, I pray you be stedfast and cautious. *Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free.* If there be one here present this night who has in the least wavered in his allegiance to our Holy and true Mother, the English Church, I beseech him, in God's name, to be firm. Think of the deadly chain of errors you would bind about your soul by turning Romanist. Think of the scorn you would cast upon the Faith of our Fathers—upon the Holy Religion taught you at a mother's knee.† Think of the dread consequences

* I have no wish to depreciate the valuable aid the Jesuit Order has rendered to the cause of education. If the Jesuit Fathers of S. Aidan's, Grahamstown, confined their religious efforts *solely* to their co-religionists, their work would be eminently praiseworthy, as tending to raise the educational tone of the Colony. But, unfortunately, they are proselytisers by virtue of their principles, and I know that Port Elizabeth is not the only place in the Eastern Province where proselytising efforts have been made.

† Besides the many holy associations which endear our holy religion to those who have known it from infancy, I would more

of an apostacy that would compel you to disown the efficacy of the Holy Orders and Sacraments of your Mother Church—that would lead you to believe that your Baptism, your Confirmation, nay, more, the Holy Communion, as ministered amongst us, was an unreal and hollow presentment—a bitter and cruel mockery—a bare memorial of an absent Christ—ashes instead of the Bread of Life.* I invoke your personal sympathy and your prayers for myself. The powerful order of Jesuits will use ceaseless efforts to injure my work and entrap your souls. I must expect bitter tongues and slanderous words ; and let me tell you, that their safest and surest slander will come from an ultra-Protestant point

especially allude to the noble compendium of the Catholic Faith which we have in the Church Catechism. I know no better way to strengthen our convictions than a frequent and thoughtful meditation upon the old familiar words, and I know no better guide to its true meaning than “*Sadler’s Church Teachers’ Manual.*”

* I have repeatedly heard Romanists deny the efficacy of the Orders and Sacraments of the English Church. Anglo-Romanists and perverts generally use the bitterest possible language in so doing. Their schismatic position, in view of a possible reunion of Christendom, leads them to follow the lead of Cardinal Manning in this respect. In a letter to Dr. Pusey the Cardinal flung the utmost scorn upon our ministrations. He admits that some of us are lawfully baptised (on the principle of admitting lay Baptism), for in his sight, and in that of all Vaticanists, our Clergy are all laymen, whose sacerdotal acts are, *ipso facto*, invalid. When we compare this false view of the English Church with the liberal admission of our Orders and catholicity by the French Roman Catholic divines of the last century in correspondence with Archbishop Wake, the contrast is astounding. On the one hand we have most friendly and large-hearted proposals of reunion under the auspices of a Cardinal, nowadays we have bitter contempt from a Cardinal who reflects the mind of the Vatican. Rome has changed ; she has broken with her own past history. The Vatican decrees are an impassable barrier to Christian reunion.

of view. I have been, and shall be, accused of personal dishonour and disloyalty.

A Catholic Priest of the English Church, logically holding the true principles of his Prayer Book—or, in common phrase, being a thorough High Churchman, as I thank God I am—is placed between two fires.* Romanists are ready to pursue him with the bitterest *scorn* and *invective*—Ultra-Protestants look upon him with *distrust* and *suspicion*. But

* Anglo-Catholics hold the only true principles of the English Prayer Book in their fulness. Those within the pale of the Anglican Communion who do not accept the *full* teaching of the Prayer Book as the authorised exposition of the Catholic Faith as laid down in Holy Writ, differ from us only on the negative side of their belief. We agree in our affirmations, and only part company when they fall short of the *full breadth* of Church teaching. Thank God, we are all drawing gradually together in spite of the devil, who, in his dread of Christian unity, tries to sow dissension by stirring up suspicions of *Romanising* against Anglo-Catholics. Protestant suspicions of Anglo-Catholic Priests take two forms: 1. That they are personally disloyal, *i.e.*, knaves; 2. That they are *loyal* to their Church *themselves*, but *unconsciously* teach doctrines which make their flocks *disloyal*, *i.e.*, that they are fools. Singularly enough the same charges are made against us by Romanists. The second charge has been made against us by Bishop Ullathorne and Monsignor Capel, who, while admitting the *loyalty* of Dr. Pusey, Canon Liddon, &c., say that they are *unconsciously* leading people to Rome. *And this in the face of a manifest decrease in the ranks of Anglo-Romanists, plainly traceable in the marriage returns of England!* If Anglo-Catholics are *unconsciously* leading people to Rome, why is the Anglo-Roman sect decreasing, and why, in the name of *common sense*, does Monsignor Capel kill the goose that lays the golden egg? Why do Roman ecclesiastics at home and here mock at our position and abuse us, if we are *really* doing their work? No more skilful words could have been framed to discredit us with the people of England than those of Bishop Ullathorne and Monsignor Capel. If High Churchmen, as a body, were not the most successful opponents of modern Romanism, they would let us alone. If we were helping them *now*, they would keep as quiet as they did in the early days of the Oxford movement, when they were blind enough to suppose that it aimed at *Romanising*, instead of *Catholicising*, the English Church.

be assured, brethren, nothing, please God, will ever drive High Churchmen into disloyalty. We are not afraid of a little misrepresentation and persecution—*God will defend the right.* God, in His loving mercy, has placed us in the English Church, and we will never be *tempted* from her by Romanism, or *driven* from her by Protestantism. We will be true to her till death. People may misrepresent us—Romanists may slander us—Protestants may distrust us—but we appeal to the Bar of God. Speaking in the presence of Almighty God, whose unworthy Priest I am, I solemnly declare my belief that modern Romanism is a gigantic apostacy from the True Catholic Faith. I believe that the English Church is a Living Branch of God's Holy Catholic Church. I believe in the Holy Orders committed to me from her. I believe in her Sacraments. This is my Confession of Faith, so help me, God!—AMEN.*

Here I take my stand until my life's end. Brethren, pray for me, that I may have grace to warn and guide the flock committed to my charge—pray for wavering souls, if any there be, that, by God's help, they may so escape the bondage of Romanism: that they may stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

* This sermon is necessarily tinged by the local circumstances of a parish crisis and a personal attack upon the preacher, which caused its original publication. It is included in this volume, with a few omissions, because there is some information in the footnotes which may possibly be useful.

VI.

THE
WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH CATHOLIC.

A Paper read before the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Grahamstown, in Synod assembled, at Grahamstown, in June, 1876.

My LORD BISHOP, My REVEREND BRETHREN IN CHRIST,—

I feel much diffidence in thus bringing to your notice a topic of such great importance. So much so that I had almost made up my mind to withdraw my paper, lest I should be occupying the time and space which would more fittingly have been accorded to my seniors in the Ministry, and in the work of this Diocese. But in deference to the advice of one of my ecclesiastical superiors, I have adhered to my original intention, and shall endeavour to bring before you some leading principles and features of the worship of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, considered especially with reference to that branch of it to which we, as English Catholics, are privileged to belong.

A RITUAL NECESSARY TO MEET THE NEEDS OF
HUMANITY.

I.—And firstly we must all agree that, though our God will have none but true heart-worship, it is abso-

lutely necessary for that worship to be clad in outward forms of seemly reverence. Our very being in this life unites the outward and inward, for man has a body and a soul. God made both the body and the soul, and the body must worship Him *outwardly* and *visibly* as the soul does *inwardly* and *spiritually*. We can no more divorce the outward and visible element of our worship from the inward and spiritual, than we can divorce body from soul in this life. Any attempt to do so must end in disaster, as being contrary to the very primary laws of our being.*

THE PURITAN THEORY.

The Puritan fixes upon the text : *God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth,*† and he presses it in favour of a purely spiritual worship, apart from all forms and ceremonies, apart from all outward expression, until he destroys outward reverence of worship altogether. He turns the Temple of God's worship into a preaching-house, blocks the Altar by the Pulpit, makes the religion of Christ a collection of frigid theological formulæ, and

* Is not the inward enough, if it be genuine and pure? And may not the outward overlay and smother it? But human nature itself, with a thousand tongues, utters the reply :—The marriage of the outward and inward pervades the universe, and the life and teaching of Christ Himself are marked by a frequent employment of signs, in which are laid the ground, and the foreshewing both of Sacraments and Ritual.—“The Church of England and Ritualism,” p. 8. Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.

† S. John iv. 24.

substitutes a drowsy attention to their public enunciation for the worship of God in the beauty of Holiness.

ITS EXPRESSION.

The Puritan says : "I can worship God spiritually anyhow and anywhere, and, therefore, I care not for outward seeming, for a dignified worship, for a well-ordered sanctuary, for reverential attitudes." But is the fact that we *can* worship God anywhere, the fact that we *can*, nay *must*, maintain an ever-abiding spiritual consciousness of His Worship and of His Presence —is *this* to make us despise and neglect that true homage of *body* and soul, that true dignity of outward worship, that decency and order which we are commanded to observe, and which we owe to our Redeemer and King? Forms and ceremonies are interwoven with our social life ; we pay honour to whom honour is due, but surely we shall not dishonour our God by paying Him less outward homage than we do to an earthly sovereign, and approaching Him with less reverence than we use to a Magistrate in Court or a Judge in Session ?

ITS LOGICAL DEVELOPMENT.

The Puritan Spirit may carry a man even further than this. If the spiritual is so entirely to efface the material in our worship, why should we stop there? If we are not to worship God with our bodies, why should we care for the deeds of the body at all ?

Thus the door is opened for Antinomian licence,* and we shall find Puritanism and Ultra-Protestantism, if pressed to their logical conclusion, first cousins to the spiritual wickednesses of the early Gnostics. We do not, in thus pressing our argument, desire to forget that men rise above the strict logical level of their creed, or to ignore the holy lives of many Puritans. The Puritan tries to be more spiritually minded than the Apostles themselves, nay more even, with reverence be it said, than our Blessed Lord Himself. We cannot forget who it was that *knelt* to pray in Gethsemane,† and if the God Incarnate worshipped with outward forms and prayed for us in the lowliness of external reverence, we must in this point, as in others, follow the blessed steps of His Most Holy Life. We need say no more then with

* This actually took place in the early days of German Protestantism. The Worship and Ritual of the Church was violently opposed by the Ultra-Protestants. One of their leaders, John Agricola, taught open Antinomianism at Wittenberg in 1538, and in 1521-25 the Anabaptists rose in arms under Munzer and Storck, and realised their Antinomianism by practising gross immoralities in the name of Protestantism. It is matter for great thankfulness that men, as a rule, rise above the level of a narrow creed. Many good men have illogically held and maintained theories, whose legitimate issues they would have shrunk from with horror.

† With regard to kneeling in prayer, we may observe that the eighteenth Canon of our Church (A.D. 1604) orders all “to reverently kneel upon their knees when the General Confession, Litany, and other Prayers are read—testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures their inward humility.” If we could resolutely carry out this plain law of our Church to the exclusion of all lounging irreverence and carelessness of attitude during the Prayers, I believe that the Clergy would find many of their difficulties vanish before this crowning victory over religious apathy and indifference.

regard to the antecedent necessity of a Ritual. It only remains for us to determine its degree and kind.

RITUAL CONSIDERED HISTORICALLY.

II.—We must examine this question historically and shape the details of our worship in accordance with the analogy of God's revealed Will.

PATRIARCHAL PERIOD.

(i.) The hints which we gather from Holy Writ as to the worship of the Patriarchal and Ante-Mosaic periods are wonderfully wrought out by Professor Blunt in his *Scriptural Coincidences*, pp. 9-11. I need not detain you with the proofs he there gathers for a *distinctive dress* in the Officiating Priest, a *special place* set apart for God's worship, and *special forms of service*.*

MOSAIC PERIOD.

(ii.) We need not linger over the Mosaic period, either in considering the careful order and harmonious detail of the early worship of Israel in the Tabernacle, or in examining the later development of dignity, grandeur, and magnificence which culminated in the Temple of Solomon.† The distinct dress of the priesthood, the

* Adam, even during the space of his small continuance in Paradise, had where to present himself before the Lord. Adam's sons had out of Paradise, in like sort, whither to bring their sacrifices. The Patriarchs used altars, mountains, and groves to the self-same purpose. Hooker, Bk. v. 2.

† Let the state of the people of God when they were in the house of bondage, and their manner of serving God in a strange land, be

fragrant clouds of incense, the measured choral Psalmody of the white-robed bands of Levites who stood to bless and praise God at morn and at even, the varied sacrifices—all foreshadowed better things to come—all were the forerunners of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church of Christ.

PURITAN OBJECTIONS.

“But,” says the Puritan, “all these things are abolished and swept away by the Gospel. Am I to turn to weak and beggarly elements again? am I to imagine that Christianity has a Ritual as well as Judaism? No such thing. I will rather reverse the whole analogy of God’s dealings with man; I will ignore the law of my being; I will resolutely shut my eyes to the glorious picture of heavenly worship and ritual presented in the Apocalypse, and, though

compared with that which Canaan and Jerusalem did afford, and who seeth not the huge difference between them? In Egypt, it may be, they were right glad to take some corner of a poor cottage, and there to serve God upon their knees, peradventure covered with dust and straw sometimes. Neither were they, therefore, the less accepted of God, but He at the length did testify that they served Him not in vain. Notwithstanding in the very desert they are no sooner possessed of some little thing of their own, but a Tabernacle is required at their hands. Being planted in the land of Canaan, and having David to be their King, when the Lord had given him rest from His enemies, it grieved his religious mind to consider the growth of his own estate and dignity. “Behold now I dwell in he house of cedar trees, and the Ark of God remaineth still within curtains.” What he did purpose, it was the pleasure of God that Solomon, his son, should perform, and perform it in a manner suitable unto their present, not to their ancient, estate and condition. For which cause Solomon writeth unto the King of Tyrus: “The house which I build is great and wonderful; for great is our God above all gods.”—Hooker, Bk. iv. 3.

I hope one day to join in it, I will, by way of fitting myself to do so, make Christian Worship and Ritual as barren a nullity as I can. God chose to give the Jews a glorious Ritual under the Old Covenant: we look forward to a glorious Ritual in heaven. But I will do my best to reduce the intervening period to a blank of hideous and chilling ugliness and ritual deformity." And we must allow that where the Puritanism of Calvin and Beza has triumphed their views have been rigorously and logically carried out.* But are we to believe the Puritan in the right? Did our blessed Lord forbid a Christian Ritual? Did the pillars and master builders of Christendom organise a dry, intellectual worship, barren of forms?

CHRISTIAN PERIOD.

III.—Our Lord and Master, so far from forbidding Ritual, even lent His sanction to its minutest developments. He rebukes sternly the Pharisaic divorce of the inward from the outward, whereby an excessive devotion to a frigid externalism excluded and des-

* The mother of such great magnificence (they—the Puritans—think) is but a proud, ambitious desire to be spoken of far and wide. Suppose we that God Himself delighted to dwell sumptuously? No; then was the Lord most acceptably served when His temples were rooms borrowed within the houses of poor men. This was suitable unto the nakedness of Jesus Christ, and the simplicity of His Gospel. [The Catholic answer]: Touching God Himself, *hath He anywhere revealed that it is His delight to dwell beggarly?* And that He taketh no pleasure to be worshipped, saving only in poor cottages? Even then was the Lord as acceptably honoured of this people as ever, when the stateliest places and things in the whole world were sought out to adorn His temple.—Hooker, Bk. v. 15.

troyed the true principles of the inner life. But in this very rebuke He allows the outward. “ *These ought ye to have done*; these mighty inner principles ye ought to have practised, *and not to leave the other undone.*”* The outward was not to be lost sight of just when the inward had adorned it with its true and real meaning. And if this could be said of Pharisaic minuteness how much more do our Master’s words apply to the order, grace, and dignity of the Christian Ritual, to those ceremonial outlines that we may well believe the Lord taught the Apostles during the great forty days when He was instructing them in *the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God,*† when He laid down for the founders of Christendom the internal and external lines upon which He willed His Holy Church to be moulded ?

If Christ’s Church was an invisible body composed of disconnected spiritual units, we might wonder at the ritual precepts and practice taught by the Apostles, but since it is an outwardly organised society, a definite worship and ritual are needful to its existence; and we might well wonder if the Apostles had *not* been taught by Christ to shape and mould the externals of Christian worship. I will not detain you with the numerous hints that we find in Holy Writ to prove this certainty of our organisation.

* S. Matt. xxiii. 23.

† Acts i. 3.

Let us take for an example S. Paul's precept: "Let everything be done ἐνσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν,"* after a dignified fashion, and according to fore-ordered arrangement." This precept was worked out by the Apostolic Church to the best of their ability. They were taught that God's angels noted the order and details of worship, even down to such a matter as a woman's veil.† I admit that the ritual arrangements of the Early Church were plain and simple, and necessarily so. How could a despised and persecuted sect, a *gens lucifuga*, whose very assemblies were under the ban of the law, and ever subject to dispersion and forcible disturbance, do otherwise?

Surely it is written of the Church struggling for her existence amid fiery persecutions, driven to hide her sacred rites in the dens and caves of the earth in those times of trial—*She hath done what she could.* I need not remind you of the touching traces to be

* I. Cor. xiv. 40.—Mr. Gladstone renders it: "Let all things be done in right, graceful, or becoming figure, and by fore-ordered arrangement."—"Ritual and Ritualism," p. 1.

† For this cause ought the woman to have ἔξοντία, a token of subjection, *i.e.*, a veil, upon her head, because of the angels.—I. Cor. xi. 10.

The house of prayer is a court, beautified with the presence of celestial powers; there we stand, we pray, we sound forth hymns unto God, having His angels intermingled as our associates; and, with reference hereunto, the Apostle doth require so great care to be had of decency for the angels' sake. How can we come into the house of prayer, and not be moved with the very glory of the place itself so to frame our affections, praying as doth best beseem them whose suits the Almighty doth there sit to hear, and His angels attend to further?—Hooker, Bk. v. 25.

found in the catacombs of her earnest desire to worship the Lord in the beauty of Holiness of the carved Altars, and rude but no less earnest efforts of early Christian Art.* No wonder then that when the Edict of Milan brought the Church into the daylight, and the first Christian Cæsar lavished his treasure upon her sanctuaries, we find her realising S. Paul's ἐνσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν in glorious Churches, stately Liturgies, and a magnificent Ritual. Persecution had fanned the flame of her inner holiness, *the King's daughter was all glorious within*, it only remained that *her clothing should be of wrought gold*, and that she should thus visibly shew forth to the world that the Christian Ritual should transcend the Mosaic, inasmuch as *the ministration of righteousness exceeds in glory the ministration of condemnation*.†

* Before the Emperor Constantine's time, under Severus, Gordian, Philip, and Galienus, the state of Christian affairs being tolerable, the former buildings, which were but of mean and small estate, contented them not; spacious and ample churches they erected throughout every city. No envy was able to be their hindrance, no practice of Satan, or fraud of men, available against their proceedings herein, while they continued as yet worthy to feel the aid of the arm of God extended over them for their safety. These churches Diocletian caused by solemn edict to be afterwards overthrown. Maximinus, with like authority, giving them leave to erect them, the hearts of all men were even rapt with divine joy to see those places, which tyrannous impiety had laid waste, recovered, as it were, out of mortal calamity. Churches reared up to a height immeasurable, and adorned with far more beauty in their restoration than their founders before had given them. Whereby we see how most Christian minds then stood affected; we see how joyful they were to behold the sumptuous stateliness of houses built unto God's glory.—Hooker, Bk. v. 15.

† Yea, then are the public duties of religion best ordered, when the militant Church doth resemble, by sensible means, as it may in such

VARIATIONS OF LITURGY AND RITUAL.

Just as the Liturgies of the Church varied in detail to suit National Churches, so did her Ritual.* And just as her Liturgies all presented the broad common features that betokened a common Apostolic origin, so did her Ritual. The Priest or Bishop ministered the sacrifice of the Altar in his “splendid vestment,”† or distinctive Eucharistic dress. We read of an Emperor presenting a splendid vestment for the solemn public administration of Holy Baptism. Clouds of incense arose heavenward to typify the prayers of the Saints. Singers were set apart to serve in the sacred ministry of a Solemn Choral Worship. Lights were burnt upon the Altars to symbolise the holy joy wrought by the Presence of

cases, that hidden dignity and glory wherewith the Church triumphant in Heaven is beautified.—Hooker, Bk. v. 6.

“*Ecclesia vero est imago coelestium.*”—S. Ambrose.

* Unity need not involve uniformity. For neither is it any man’s duty to clothe all his children, or all his servants, with one weed, nor theirs to clothe themselves so, if it were left to their own judgments, as these ceremonies are left of God to the judgment of the Church.—Hooker, Bk. iv. 13.

† The Bishop or Priest who celebrated the Holy Communion is described in the Apostolical Constitutions, Bk. viii. c. 12—as being clad in “a splendid vestment” (*λαμπρὰν ἔσθητα*). S. Paul mentions a special garment (*φαιλόνη*) that he left with Carpus (II. Timothy iv. 13). The word used does not imply any ordinary garment of every-day life, and the very same word at the present day signifies, and has signified for ages, the Eucharistic vestment of the Eastern Church. Without desiring to press this interpretation unduly, it is, at least, highly probable that the vestment and books which S. Paul mentions with such special care, were sacred to the service of the Altar, otherwise we could hardly account for his introducing a message about them into his dying words and farewell counsel to his own son in the faith.

the True Light of the World. The holy sign of the Cross was set upon God's Altar as the sign of the Redeemer's triumph and glory. Such was the Ritual of the Holy Catholic Church when the seamless robe of Christ was as yet unrent by the schisms which have severed East from West, Oriental and Roman from Anglican.

RITUAL OF ENGLISH CHURCH.

But the practical question remains, What is the ritual and worship of our own Mother Church? Upon what lines does she move in matters ceremonial? Is she a Puritan sect only some 300 years old, or does she claim a direct historical continuity with the doctrine, discipline, and ritual of the Church Primitive?

There is only one answer possible to an intelligent Churchman; only one logical defence of our position against the dissent and schism of Rome and Geneva. "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church. I believe that, as an English Churchman, I am a Catholic; that by the Apostolic Succession of the Threefold Ministry I am linked to the Church of Christ and His Apostles in doctrine, discipline, and ritual."

The English Reformation, first conceived by the master mind of Wolsey,* organised and moulded by

* The character of Cardinal Wolsey has suffered grievously from the popular misconceptions of his countrymen. A true and just view of his large-hearted designs for the reformation of the English Church will be

Archbishop Parker, matured by Andrews, Laud, and Cosin, was no setting up of a new Church. It was the organisation of the Church Catholic for the English Empire and Nation upon the true ancient lines. It was the withdrawal of our communion from the centralising tyranny of the Western Patriarchate, and not a day too soon; for the taste for manufacturing dogmas, acquired at Trent, has found its natural development in the disastrous Pontificate of Pius IX., and the Vatican decrees of 1870.* And thus the English Reformation is glorious, even though it be tainted in its execution by the work of unhallowed men's hands. It is glorious, because it has made our Church Primitive Catholic and Apostolic. And therefore the broad lines of Primitive Ritual and Worship are our glorious heritage for ever.† I say

found in J. H. Blunt's "History of the Reformation," P. v. 1. He did not see the fruits of his great conception, because he served a tyrannical master, and because he tried to reform the Church by the aid of external authority, as *Legatus a latere*.

* Despite their apologists, the Vatican decrees are absolutely incompatible with true civil allegiance. No one has confuted the unanswerable arguments of Mr. Gladstone, and we can only rely upon the honour and patriotism of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens, and trust that it will soar above the level of these novel additions to their creed.

† The Act of 2nd and 3rd Edward VI., c. i., sec. 7, defines the term "primitive" to be 500 years or more after Christ's Ascension. The Primitive Ritual of the Catholic Church is thus our portion and legal right. The 30th Canon of A.D. 1603 reaffirms this principle, for it declares that the Church of England "only departed from the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, or any such like Churches," so far as they had fallen from themselves in their ancient integrity.

the *broad* lines advisedly, because, as in early times, National Churches took their own line in minor details, so have we English Churchmen done. Our Ritual Law, contained in the short and simple direction of the *Ornaments' Rubric*, points to a modification of mediæval ceremonial.

The vestments of the second year of Edward VI. tend to simplicity and to the reduction of ultra-ceremonialism. The one grand point is asserted in maintaining the Catholic and Primitive principle of a *distinctive Eucharistic dress for the celebrant*, and the manner of carrying it out is national. The mediæval confusion of Altar lights is done away with,—the Altar of the National Church is not to be crowded up with an unmeaning multiplicity of candles. The beauty of primitive symbolism is maintained by our national use of two lights only upon the Altar to signify (in the words of King Edward's Injunctions of A.D. 1547) that *Christ is the true Light of the world*. Superstitious uses are taken away, but the *chanels shall remain as in times past*. The Altar Cross is Catholic and Primitive, and therefore lawful in the Anglican Church.* The chancel shall be

* [See S. Chrysostom, chap. ix., *Treatise against Jews, &c.*] The Privy Council, in *Liddell v. Westerton*, did not impugn our right to place the symbol of our faith upon our Altars, and also declared our right to use different coloured Altar cloths to mark the different Church seasons. We are taught by the eye as well as by the ear. The sombre Violet of Lent and Advent reminds us of sin and self-discipline; the Green of Trinity-tide, reminds us of God's Eternal Being manifested in

reserved for the Clergy, with their band of surpliced choristers, wherewith to render, where possible, the choral worship of Almighty God.

THE RITUAL QUESTION OF TO-DAY.

I will not multiply authorities, or plunge into the interminable sea of debate upon which our Mother Church is tossed. The Church of this Province is freed from the taint of Erastian oppression ; we are happily saved from the degradation of seeing our Bishops surrender their pastoral staves into the hands of an ex-Divorce Court Judge. We have nothing to do with the recent decisions of the Privy Council or with the decisions of Lord Penzance. We have our own Courts, and these questions of doctrine and worship will be decided by them should any question arise, and we can trust to decisions in accordance with the broad lines of the English Church apart from political or party considerations. The issues are clearer here, and questions can be tried on their merits, although we may hope that none will arise. My brethren will bear with me whilst I venture to lay before them the standpoint from which I, in common with thousands of the Clergy and laity, have been

the pervading tint of His Kingdom of Nature ; the Red bids us remember the martyr blood which is the seed of the Church and the Spirit's power which wrought their victory ; and the White of Christmas and Easter bids us mark the Victory of our Redeemer, and look forward to the pure glories of His Kingdom.

taught to view these questions. We believe that an absolute uniformity in worship was never contemplated by the Fathers of the Reformation. They had to deal with opposing schools of thought, and they set up a *maximum* standard of worship which was not to be exceeded, and also a *minimum* standard, below which the level of Anglican worship was not to descend.*

The *maximum* standard is to be found in the Ornaments' Rubric, the *minimum* in the Canon of 1604, enjoining the use of the surplice. Between these two limits, divergency may be permitted with the consent of the Bishop as Ordinary, and with the mutual goodwill of priest and people. We believe that the *true* settlement of all vexed questions of Ritual lies in mutual toleration, based upon the harmonious union and sympathy of these three factors in the problem—the *Bishop*, the *Priest*, and the *People*. The maximum standard of the Ornaments' Rubric must be tolerated by those who are themselves content to fall short of it—there must be

* In truth, the whole temporal theory of the Reformed Church of England, as a middle term between two great religious schools intended to be comprised within it, is entirely alien from the enforcement of a persecuting uniformity of doctrine or practice. It was intended to hold the Old and the New Learning, the Catholic and the Luther-Calvinist at once, with a common order of worship which, without rudely abandoning the ancient lines, should yet have as little as possible to grate on the consciences of those who had revolted from the too elaborate ceremonialism of the fifteenth century, an era anything but remarkable for morals and orthodoxy.—*Church Times*, June 16th, 1876.

no attempt to force all men into one mould. Unity and uniformity are God's gifts. We must pray for, and *work* for, the peace of Jerusalem, but a rigid uniformity of Ritual may be only a frozen crust covering a very volcano underneath. It is just this that has raised the storm in England. We have no sympathy with Ritual eccentricities, but the great historical High Church school must have *justice*. We do not wish to *enforce* the maximum of Ritual upon our brethren, we therefore may fairly ask them to let us alone. It is not seemly or in consonance with English justice that the Church Association should send paid spies to gaze upon celebrations of the Holy Communion, that upon such evidence they may drag faithful and hard-working priests into ecclesiastical lawsuits.* It is a known

* My statement is somewhat startling, but, alas! too true. I quote from the bill of costs presented by the Church Association to the Churchwardens of S. Alban's, Holborn: "July, 1869—Attending Mr. Pond, instructing him to attend S. Alban's on Sunday, July 11th, 6s. 8d.; taking his statement, 18s. 6d.; paid him for his attendance, £2 2s.; *instructing him to attend the early Communion* on July 12th, and four following days, 6s. 6d.; *paid him for his attendance*, £5 5s." The truth of this disgraceful fact is attested by the names of Thomas Layman and Elijah Cornish, Churchwardens. One would marvel if English *gentlemen* made use of paid spies to further a civil suit, but the bare idea of the evangelical *clergymen and laymen*, who compose the Church Association, daring to profane the Blessed Sacrament by the intrusion of a paid spy during its celebration, *merely* to found a ritual case against a clergyman who has worked wonders in one of the worst districts of London, is almost past belief. The ritual of S. Alban's, Holborn, may have exceeded due bounds, but the clergy and parishioners have not thereby forfeited their rights to be treated as *Englishmen*! [This practice of spying was condemned strongly by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his judgment in the Lincoln case.]

fact, alluded to in a recent leader in the *Guardian*, that the Church Association has the *greatest difficulty* in finding aggrieved parishioners to sustain their suits. The question of ceremonial is a lay question, and thousands of the laity are more strongly attached to ceremonial than the Clergy. The petition of 1,400 *bonâ fide* working men to Convocation, 1,100 of whom were Communicants, is, as the Bishop of London observed, a *great fact*. They want toleration for the Clergy who have Christianised them and worked among them. They do not want to bolster up individual eccentricities, but they want toleration in accordance with the maximum of Ritual allowed by the Ornaments' Rubric.

Thank God we need not in this Province or Diocese ask for *toleration* in matters ceremonial. Our Bishops have *themselves* acted upon the Ornaments' Rubric in restoring the use of the Pastoral Staff and Crosier, which had so long fallen into abeyance. Where our Bishops have led the way we priests need not fear to follow. The chief point to be remembered is that the priest, without bartering his lawful authority and independence, should consult with his Communicants. Let the standard of Ritual be raised from beneath, and not forced down upon the people by the priest. If the priest finds two schools of thought amongst his flock, his Church services may be moulded to suit both.

Those who attend Matins and 11 o'clock Celebration need not concern themselves with what is done at the early service. A basis of mutual forbearance and toleration may thus be established.

But above all, let us work gradually and patiently to raise the tone of our people in matters of worship and reverence. I feel convinced that, as your Lordship stated in your charge to this Synod,* in a few years we shall be astonished at the controversial literature evoked by the *Ornaments' Rubric*. If the Church Association had only let us alone, Mr. Maccoll and Mr. Beresford Hope and Mr. Gladstone would have had no need to defend and state to the world our impregnable position in matters ritual. Let us open our Churches for private prayer—teach our people to kneel before the Lord our Maker—train our Confirmation candidates in habits of reverence and devotion—make our best efforts to raise the tone of our services—remembering always that, *as with the priest so with the people*, the reverence and devotion of our flocks is shaped and guided by our own; and may the Lord endue us all with the spirit of charity, forbearance, and sound judgment, that we may so worthily worship Him here on earth that we may one day praise Him for ever in the glorious worship of the Kingdom of Heaven.

* Charge of the Lord Bishop of Grahamstown, 1876, p. 22.

VII.

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION OF THE LAITY, IN THE BODY OF CHRIST.

*A Sermon Preached in Substance in S. Paul's Cathedral,
at Evensong on Sunday, September 17th, 1893.*

“Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation.”—
I. Peter ii. 9.

S. PETER does not address these words to the members of an invisible Church, who are themselves invisible, and undiscernible by the mass of mankind. He is writing to persons who needed to be told to lay aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings. He addresses the rank and file of Christendom, the ordinary men and women who have been brought by Baptism into the fold of the visible Church, and he tells them that they are—notwithstanding their sins and frailties—“a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, and an holy nation.” He implies that, in some very real and definite way, they fall within the scope of our Lord’s words, “Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain”

(S. John xv. 16). S. John uses language just as distinct as that of S. Peter with regard to our Lord having ordained all Christian people to the royal and universal priesthood of His Church. Addressing the Seven Churches of Asia, he says, "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own Blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen" (Rev. i. 5, 6).

We have to examine, first of all, the witness of the Church to the reality of this royal priesthood of believers. It is no mere rhetorical phrase. It expresses a living and practical reality, which has been acknowledged with definiteness in every period of the life of the Church. We find that the Israelites under the Old Covenant were "a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Exod. xix. 6). When the visible Church of the Hebrews had done its appointed work in preparing the world for the Gospel—a work for which it was specially fitted by the exclusiveness of its nationalism—the visible Church of the Day of Pentecost arose out of it in the fulness of a world-embracing Catholicity. But if "the ministration of condemnation"—the priestly character of the Church of the Old Covenant—be glorious, as S. Paul says, his deduction is natural enough that the "ministration of righteousness"—the priestly character of the Church of the New Covenant—should exceed it in glory.

The idea of priesthood implies the approach to God on behalf of others. If this idea was limited in its expression under the Old Covenant, it was, nevertheless, real and true. But the Church of the New Covenant has to "disciple all nations," and win the world to Christ. All the faithful are priests to intercede on behalf of the nations that sit in darkness. "God will have all men to be saved" (I. Tim. ii. 4), and the intercessions of the faithful members of the Body of Christ are offered for the whole world. This royal priesthood of the faithful ~~we~~ is acknowledged by the witness and testimony of the great leaders and teachers of every period of Christian history. The witness of Apostles, ~~which we have already cited~~, finds its echo in the words of Justin Martyr, who lived on the confines of the sub-Apostolic age. He calls the members of the Body of Christ "the high priestly race of God" (Dial. contra Tryph. 117). Later on, in the ante-Nicene period, we find S. Irenæus using similar language when he says that "Every just man is of the priestly order" (Bk. iv., 8), and Tertullian saying, "Are not we laymen also priests?" (De Exhort. Cast. vii., p. 522). When we turn to the period of the great Councils of the Church, we find S. Augustine saying that the national priesthood of the Jewish nation was a figure "of that future royal priesthood which is in the Church" (Quæst. Evan. ii., 40-3), and S. Leo the Great speaks of the "people of the adop-

tion of God, Whose universal society is priestly and royal" (Serm. iii. 2).

To carry the chain of testimony further, we find Isidore of Seville alluding to Baptism and Confirmation in the words: "Therefore because we are a royal and priestly race, we are on that account anointed after our baptismal washing in order that we may be reckoned amongst those who are of the Name of Christ" (De. Eccl. Off. ii., 25). We will cite one testimony more from that mediæval period in which the due position of the laity had become greatly obscured. The greatest of the schoolmen, S. Thomas Aquinas, says that "the righteous layman is united to Christ in a spiritual union by faith and love, and therefore hath a spiritual priesthood for the offering of spiritual sacrifices" (Summa. iii. 82, 1). We may, therefore, safely conclude that the common witness of the Church clearly defines the fact that the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers is part and parcel of the faith once delivered to the saints.

We have now to examine the scope and meaning of this priesthood, and the manner in which it is expressed and conveyed. First of all, we must remember that it is conveyed to the Church as the heritage of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God was given to the whole Church, and not to the Clergy only. The great doctrine of

Apostolical Succession has been unjustly subjected to cavil and doubt, because men have failed to understand the full breadth of its meaning. It is the common heritage of the whole Church, and the laity have their due share in it as well as the Clergy. The doctrine of the Apostolical Succession was not meant to foster a narrow clericalism, or to confine the Church to the Clergy only. The Apostolical Succession of the Threefold Ministry in the Catholic Church is only a part and portion of the Apostolical Succession of the whole body of the faithful.

The ministration of Holy Baptism was anciently confined to the Bishop, and Confirmation was regarded as the completion of Baptism. When S. Jerome said that "Baptism was the priesthood of the laity" (*Adv. Lucifer*, 4), he did not intend to exclude that completion of Baptism by Confirmation, which Isidore of Seville alludes to when he says that "the whole Church is consecrated with the anointing of the Chrism" (*De Eccl. Off.* ii., 25).

In Confirmation the Bishop, by the laying-on of hands, completes the Baptisms administered by his Clergy, and we may safely regard Confirmation as the ordination of the laity to the royal priesthood of the Church. Unless the Bishop is a validly consecrated successor of the Apostles, he cannot become the channel to convey the Apostolical Succession of the Church, with its special gift of the Holy

Spirit to the laity. Thus we see that the Apostolical Succession of the Threefold Ministry is intended to convey that succession of spiritual gifts to the laity, and to maintain and perpetuate the universal priesthood of the members of the Body of Christ. We have now seen that the Apostolical Succession, with its diversities of gifts, belongs to the whole Church, and also that we may rightly call the Apostolical rite of the laying-on of hands the ordination of the laity to their royal priesthood. It remains for us now to trace the scope and meaning of that priesthood, and the true meaning of its expression. We have already seen that it is a priesthood of missionary intercession. It is also a priesthood of worship, which finds its highest expression in the Holy Eucharist as the great central act of Christian worship.

Just as the universal priesthood of the Israelites under the Old Covenant found its expression in the Levitical priesthood and its ministrations, so does the universal priesthood of the Catholic Church find its expression in the ministrations of the Threefold Apostolic Ministry as the organs of the Body of Christ.

S. Paul says: "The bread which *we* break, the cup of blessing which *we* bless" (1 Cor. x. 16). This is no conventional plural of dignity or majesty. It represents the fact that the Bishop or priest who

stands at the Altar to celebrate the Holy Mysteries is representing the priesthood of the laity. He unites them to himself in the great act of worship and offering. His voice represents the voice of the Body of Christ. His consecrating hand is the instrument of the Body of Christ. It is for this reason that the Church so jealously guards the true succession of her ministers. If their ministerial commission were invalid, if it were not derived by direct succession from our Lord and the Apostles whom He commissioned, they would have no right to represent the priesthood of the laity, they would have no right to speak and act as organs of the Body of Christ.

Hugh of S. Victor, a well-known mediæval theologian, has a firm grasp of this truth. He says that a heretic or schismatic could not validly celebrate the Holy Eucharist, because the priest speaks for the whole Church (*Summ. Sentent. vi., 9*), and one who, by his own wilful choice, has distorted, or departed from, the doctrines of the Church, or who has carried his wrong teaching into the further stage of actual separation from the communion of the faithful, cannot represent the Church.

It is for this reason that solitary Masses are contrary to the mind of the Catholic Church. The presence of the faithful is necessary, and the priest has no right to exercise his office as celebrant unless the representative character of his priesthood is

manifested by the presence of others. The mediæval idea of the solitary Mass is the outcome of an un-Catholic sacerdotalism, and we have to be very thankful for the restoration of the obscured priesthood of the Body of Christ by the Anglican rubric which forbids the priest to celebrate a solitary Eucharist. If the idea were once admitted that a priest had a right to celebrate the Eucharist without the presence of others, the true representative character of the Christian priesthood would be obscured. It would be displaced by an untrue officialism, which would make the priesthood vicarious instead of representative, and the priest would act instead of the people rather than as their leader and representative.

On the other hand, the laity must realise the truth that their priesthood cannot be represented except through the appointed channel of the Apostolic Ministry. Here is the true dissuasive against resorting to ministries and Christian organisations of human origin. The Divinely-constituted order of the Church must be maintained by the laity as well as the Clergy. It concerns them just as much. The layman who forsakes the ministrations of the Apostolic Ministry, not only cuts himself off from the certified channels of Divine grace, and exchanges valid sacraments for precarious substitutes, but he forfeits the grace of his own Apostolical Succession,

and hinders himself from exercising that royal priesthood which he has received from Christ our Lord.

My brethren, I feel that this great doctrine of the priesthood of the laity needs to be set forth prominently in England at the present time. I am aware that the laity are realising more and more the spiritual side of their priesthood. The Holy Eucharist is becoming more and more the centre of worship, and the primitive ideal of a life of devotion and service—the corporate life of the citizens of the City of God—is gradually supplanting the narrowness of individualism and the unreal conception of religion as the holding of a series of opinions, or as the influence of a series of emotions.

The ministrations and energies of the laity find multiform expression in the organisation of a well-ordered parish. The consecration of their offerings to the service of God is manifest in restored cathedrals and churches, and in the building of noble and dignified houses of prayer which recall and revive the architectural glories of past ages. The work of the Church in England is being extended in every direction by individual effort, but thoughtful Churchmen notice a distinct lack of corporate life and power. Why is this? Must we put it down to the undue congregationalism which is undoubtedly one effect of the parochial system? Ought we to attribute this to

that concentration of gifts, power, and energy upon his own parish, which sometimes tempts the parish priest to forget the corporate side of Church life?

I can only lay before you the conclusions of an independent observer, who has ministered for nearly twenty years in South Africa, and has, therefore, had opportunities of testing by practical experience the value of lay co-operation in the Synods of the Church. The laity in England have lost their ancient, Primitive, and Catholic privileges and their legitimate position in Church matters. They have been content to acquiesce in the loss, and to exercise an illegitimate influence in the Church, which finds its expression in captious opposition in vestry meetings, and in a curious contentment with the results of an Erastianism and a subjection of the Church to the State in England, to which the Established Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland has never submitted.

Permit me, for a moment, to use the privilege of addressing you as a stranger, whose home is 6,000 miles away, speaking from the pulpit of this great Mother Church, which is looked upon as a centre and home of worship throughout Anglican Christendom, and let me tell you plainly that the restoration of the laity to their ancient Catholic privileges in our South African Synods, and in the election of our Bishops, has caused such a realisation of the corporate life of the Church as is at present unknown in the Church

of England. Our experience in South Africa only reflects the experience of a hundred years of freedom in our sister Church of America, and it is repeated in all the Free Churches of our Communion. The due place of the laity in the Councils and Synods of the Church was recognised and taught by great leaders like S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, and S. Leo the Great, just as clearly as the doctrine of the universal priesthood of the faithful.

Is it necessary for the Church of England of to-day to acquiesce tamely in the loss of these privileges of the laity? The danger of acquiescence is a pressing one. Laymen sit in your Diocesan Conferences, and Houses of Laymen sit in conjunction with the Convocations of Canterbury and York. But these bodies have no real legislative power. If the ancient privileges of the laity were restored in the Church of England, we should not find men like the late Bishop Moberly of Salisbury complaining of "the Erastianism which exists in the Church of England," and declaring that a Bishop of the Church of England works, "as it were, in chains." We should see the restoration of spiritual courts of first instance and final appeal, and we should see the fetters and restrictions upon the Church of England which were imposed upon her by the Tudor despotism speedily removed. It has been well said that the State as well as the Church was enslaved by the Tudor monarchs. But

the State was gradually emancipated until the present constitutional and democratic freedom of Englishmen was attained. The disabilities of Nonconformists, Roman Catholics, and Jews have been one by one removed, but the disabilities of Churchmen remain. The only remnant of the Tudor tyranny left in England is the fettered condition of that Church which has been the mother of English freedom. The Royal Supremacy has passed into the supremacy of a Parliament which is as purely secular as the American Congress.

And then, Churchmen in England are told that the Church cannot be set free from the Erastian fetters imposed by the State without being robbed of her temporal possessions. Is it vain to appeal to the justice of the people of England, and to ask that the Church shall have the same spiritual liberties as the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland? Is it vain to ask for spiritual courts, free synods, and free assemblies for the election of Bishops, in which the laity should have their due share and place? Is the reply to be, "We will not unloose your fetters, unless we take your purse." The temptation is great. The natural impatience of Churchmen, who see and realise the blessings which freedom from State interference has brought to the Free Churches of the Anglican Communion, prompts them to fling the purse at the oppressor, and say, "Take it, and let me go free." But

patience is the first duty of the Church of England just now. She must consolidate the powers and energies of her corporate life, she must dissever herself from political action, and resolutely decline to be identified with one party in the State, even if it be necessary to vindicate her impartiality by the voluntary removal of her Bishops from the House of Lords. She must strengthen her hold upon the laity until her own sons are not ashamed to maintain her true spiritual liberties in Parliament, so that she may be able to make her own terms with the State, and obtain her freedom and the removal of her disabilities without incurring more pecuniary loss than the generosity of her people could immediately replace. If failure be the eventful issue of all attempts at reform and readjustment in the relations between Church and State in England, the closer union between the Mother and daughter Churches which will result from this failure will be found to be the fullest compensation for any secular advantages that have been forfeited. A canonically defined Patriarchate of Canterbury, a central spiritual Tribunal of Appeal, and a General Synod for the whole Anglican Communion would cease to be ideals, and would be realised by the logic of necessity. The due recognition of the Catholic privileges of the priesthood of the laity would react with blessing upon the Church of England, as it has already done in the free daughter Churches. Do

not think I have set before you an impracticable ideal. No ideal that has been realised in America and the Colonies can be deemed visionary or impracticable in England.

We Churchmen have a goodly heritage. The battle of the faith and worship of the Church has already been won in England. The battle of her discipline and organisation, the restoration of her lost liberties, and of the ancient rights of the laity, has yet to be fought and won. In quietness and confidence shall be our strength, until the words of the great Charter, "That the Church of England may be free and have her liberties uninjured and her rights untouched," find their ultimate realisation in a "Free Church in a Free State."

VIII.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

*A Sermon preached in the University Church, Cambridge,
on October 11th, 1893.*

“That they all may be one: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.”—S. John xvii. 21.

OUR Lord’s prayer for the unity of Christendom is directly linked with the idea of its missionary progress. The forces of a divided and disunited Christendom can never win great victories in the face of the enemy. Here and there, there may be isolated instances of successful skirmishes or spasmodic sorties against the beleaguring forces of heathenism, but there can be no real conquest on a large scale whilst Christendom is disunited. The Anglican Communion holds a central position in Christendom. She offers herself as “the Church of the Reconciliation” to the jarring factions and divided forces of all “who profess and call themselves Christians.”

The phrase “The Church of the Reconciliation” is more frequently heard in our sister Church of America than in England, where hopes of reunion are

crippled by the difficulties caused by the union of Church and State.

In America our Church is freed from all difficulties which arise from the State connexion, and is, therefore, able to offer herself with more freedom as a centre of reunion for other Christians. We must first consider the twofold witness of the Anglican Church to the *Faith once delivered to the Saints*.

That twofold witness is the joint testimony of the Bible and of the Catholic Church. Neither witness was meant by God's providence to stand alone. The Church is the visible society organised by the Apostles of our Lord when they had been illuminated by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. But the Church was not meant to bear witness to the Gospel alone. The Church came before the world with the written witness of the Bible as the written revelation of the mind of God. But since the Canon of Scripture was not finally settled by the Church till the third century after Christ, the Bible cannot stand alone apart from the witness of the living voice of the Church. It is sad to contemplate the divided lives of two great Englishmen who have not long been taken from us, Cardinal Manning and Mr. Spurgeon. Each in their special way did a grand and noble work for God. But if these two great men had been sent to preach the Gospel *together*, like S. Paul and S. Barnabas, they would have found it impossible to agree in their

teaching. Broadly speaking, Cardinal Manning set forth the witness of the Church *alone*, and Mr. Spurgeon the witness of the Bible *alone*. The Anglican Church, with her twofold witness of the Church *and* the Bible, might have formed a medium of reconciliation for the teaching of these two great men, who each held truths valuable in their own special way.

The Church cannot stand alone without the Bible, and the Bible cannot stand alone without the Church. The twofold witness of the Bible and the Church finds its point of union and reconciliation in the English Church. As representing the Apostolic order and historical continuity of the Primitive Church she appeals to us as the “Pillar and ground of the truth,” the witness and keeper of Holy Writ. In her sixth Article she sets forth the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures, “so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith.”

The English Church, then, notwithstanding her defects and blemishes, which no thoughtful Churchman would deny, can thus set herself forward as the Church of the Reconciliation.

We may at first be tempted to look on the divisions of Christendom with utter and faithless despair. But we have no right to do so. Our Lord’s prayer for the

unity of all His disciples, which we chose for our text, cannot fail in its object. The outward divisions of Christendom are but temporary, and so we can look them boldly in the face, because we know that God in His own good time, and in His own good way, can restore the unity of Pentecost.

Let us now temperately and calmly examine the main divisions of Christendom.

I.—To begin with, there are the two great communions which share with us the blessings of the Historic Episcopate, which Bishop Lightfoot of Durham so aptly termed “the historic backbone of the Church.”

First of all, there is the Church of Rome, with its magnificent organisation and splendid zeal of personal devotion, which we cannot fail to admire. But much as we may admire the noble work for God which she has accomplished, and the courage of her missionaries to the heathen, we feel and know that union with Rome is impossible so long as the Roman Church imposes un-Catholic terms of communion. We cannot accept the Bishop of Rome as the infallible ruler of Christendom, nor can we accept the additions to the Nicene Creed which the Church of Rome has made. She has shut the door by her own action upon all possibilities of reunion until she retraces her steps. But there are voices hopeful of reunion, uttered out of the bosom of the Roman

Catholic Church herself, which may bid us hope and pray.

We cannot forget the kindly and hopeful negotiations between Archbishop Wake and the Gallican Divines at the beginning of the last century, nor Courayer's admirable defence of Anglican Orders.

Listen to the words of Count de Maistre, a noble-hearted French Roman Catholic layman, who, whilst living and dying a staunch Roman Catholic, could thus write of the English Church as the possible pivot of a reunited Christendom: "If ever Christians reunite, it seems likely that the impulse must start from the English Church. The English Church, which touches us on the one hand, touches on the other hand those whom we cannot touch. *She is very precious*, and, perhaps, capable of reconciling elements inassociable from their nature." With this remarkable testimony from a Roman Catholic to the future of the English Church, as the possible centre of union between Rome and non-Episcopal communions, we will leave this part of the subject.

II.—Then there is the Greek Church, the Holy Eastern Church, which numbers ninety millions of our fellow Christians. We have not here to deal with stereotyped forms of error. The authorities of the Eastern Church always treat the English Church with a courteous friendliness that is in itself an earnest of reunion. A comparison between

the Russian Church Catechism and our own would shew more points of union between us than points of difference, and when we see the Church of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom shaking off the lethargy produced by centuries of persecution and oppression, and doing the noble missionary work she is at present doing in Japan, we have the brightest hopes for the future of the Eastern Church.

III.—And now we turn from these two great bodies of our fellow Christians to those non-Episcopal communions which have mainly arisen since the Reformation. What hopes of union are there with the Lutherans, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, and, in South Africa, with our Dutch Reformed brethren? The first thing to be done in considering our relations with these non-Episcopal communions is to thank Almighty God for the noble work done by them, and for all the manifold workings of the Holy Spirit which are manifest among them, their ardent missionary zeal and their loyalty to their convictions of the Truth and Will of Christ our Lord.

We do not in the least imperil or impair our own heritage of Apostolic truth and order, when we thus thankfully recognise the workings of the Divine Spirit outside the certified channels of the Threefold Ministry and the Sacraments entrusted to its guardianship.

In approaching these our separated brethren with any proposals of reunion, we must remember to start with the truths of God which they already undoubtedly teach and hold. Mere controversy is useless and is apt to degenerate into an empty strife of pens and tongues. It must be our effort to shew them that we ourselves hold all the truths of the Gospel which they hold, so that possible future union will not entail upon them the loss of the God-given truths which they already possess. We have to convince them that they would gain a great deal and lose nothing by union.

We Anglicans must be conscious of a certain stiffness and rigidity of system, which has a tendency to repel rather than win others to union. It comes, partly from the results of the connection between Church and State in England, and partly from the national insular stiffness of Englishmen.

We must approach this question of reunion with the consciousness that our own system is not perfect. We have something to learn from the Roman Catholics, from the Eastern Church, and from the non-Episcopal communions.

In approaching this question, we must be conscious of its vast importance. Our Lord prayed that we might all be one, "*that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*" The missionary progress of the Church depends upon its *unity*.

All bitterness of spirit on *both* sides must be avoided. It is painful to hear some young Anglican clergyman, who perchance veils his theological ignorance by an excessive devotion to the externals of worship, calling other Christians "heretics and schismatics." We must remember that God does not call those persons "heretics and schismatics" who are not wilfully acting in opposition to the Divine will and purpose. God does not condemn anyone whose early training and inherited prejudices prevent him from seeing the full truths and blessings which are revealed in the visible corporate unity of the Church. We must remember that all these separated fellow Christians who have received the One Baptism, which Christ ordained, from their own ministers, are just as much members of the Catholic Church as we are ourselves.

God judges people by what they *know*, and not by what they do not know. It is only *wilful* heresy and schism that constitutes sin.

On the other hand, we must ask our separated brethren not to hurl hard words at us. The Bishop of Truro was some time ago denounced by a leading Wesleyan minister as an "ignorant and pompous schismatic," because he ventured to say that he thought that the Wesleyans were good but mistaken people. Less than this he could hardly have said if he believed in the Faith and Unity of the Church.

And so we must abstain from hard words on either side, if peace is to be promoted at all. Each side must give the other credit for earnestness of purpose and the desire to fulfil the will of God.

And now let us see what the English Church has to say to our non-Episcopal brethren. I say “the English Church” advisedly, for no individual clergyman has any right to suggest terms of reunion *on his own private judgment or authority*.

In 1888 the Bishops of the whole Anglican Communion assembled in solemn Council at Lambeth, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The American Bishops had previously dealt with this question of reunion on a broad and conciliatory basis. Their conclusions were practically adopted and endorsed by the Lambeth Conference, and put forth to the world with the immense moral weight and authority of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the 143 Archbishops and Bishops who sat in the Council. Every Anglican clergyman is morally bound by the decision thus arrived at in dealing with this momentous question.

Here are four conditions which are embodied in that decision, the acceptance of which would involve corporate union :—

I.—The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as “containing all things necessary to salva-

tion," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of Faith.

II.—The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol, and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

III.—The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself; Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

IV.—The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

We note that the *accidents* and *essence* of the Anglican position are carefully separated. It is not necessary to reunion for a body of Christians to be compelled to adopt the Anglican Prayer Book, time hallowed and noble though it be, as a book of devotion and worship.

It is not necessary to impose the XXXIX. Articles of Religion as terms of communion, since they are manifestly coloured by the special exigencies of the controversies which divided Churchmen during the Elizabethan period. We cannot accept any schemes for conditional re-ordination of ministers who have not received Episcopal ordination. Nor can we insult those ministers by accepting their present ordinations as constituting them a sort of perpetual diaconate,

which would allow them to preach and baptise, and not to celebrate the Eucharist.

The Historic Episcopate must be accepted as the Primitive Church accepted it, and the Threefold Ministry must be recognised as constituting the only valid expression of the priesthood of the laity, and the Apostolic Succession of the whole body of the faithful.

Union with the Church of Pentecost involves the acceptance of the Historic Episcopate, which was ordained by Christ through His Apostles, and involves the due administration of the two great Sacraments of the Gospel. We may not see any positive fruits of these conditions of reunion in our own day. But they may afford hope for the future, and they may lead men to ponder the questions involved calmly and dispassionately, and dispel some of this illogical sectarian bitterness on both sides.

Our plain duty, as Churchmen, is to pray for the peace of Jerusalem, and to endeavour by our courteous and friendly intercourse with our separated brethren to promote peace. We can hold fast our own principles of Apostolic truth and order in a spirit of love and charity. We can prize and adorn our own heritage, and at the same time shew brotherliness to those who believe that they are doing God's will in remaining apart from us. We can thank God and rejoice over their preaching of Christ as S. Paul

would have done. The large-hearted Apostle could rejoice when Christ was preached "in every way," and so can we. Our Lord's prayer for unity will find its fulfilment in the Church *on earth* even as it now finds its fulfilment in the Church *in Paradise*. There, even now, we may think of many great Christian leaders severed in this life, as were Manning and Spurgeon, Newman and Keble, as being *at one* in the presence of Christ. One day our unhappy divisions will end in the eternal peace of God.

IX.

THE MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH.

Being a Paper read before the Birmingham Church Congress of 1893.

BEFORE entering upon my subject, I feel bound to make one preliminary remark. When I was asked to read a paper on "Foreign Missions," the title seemed to me, as a colonist, somewhat ill-chosen.

The Church of England was a great unifying force in the days of the Heptarchy, and drew Englishmen together. The daughter Churches of the Anglican Communion, knit to the Mother Church by strong ties of loyalty, and forming with her the true spiritual home of the Anglo-Saxon race, are a great unifying force to bind America to England and the Colonies to the Empire. But the ears of colonists are sensitive. The term "Foreign Missions," as applied to the work of the Church in the great self-governing Colonies, is singularly misleading and inappropriate.

The Clergy and laity of the Colonies have a distinct objection to their being described under the head of "Foreign Missions." It is a minor point, I

know, and I shall be told that the common antithesis of "Home and Foreign Missions" is too convenient to be given up. But these minor points deserve attention if we are to preserve the solidarity of the Anglican Communion, and cement its union with a carefully defined Patriarchate of Canterbury as its true centre. I am aware that we have certain Missions in foreign territories. But our most important Mission work is under the British flag, and for this reason I prefer to define my subject as being "The Indian, Colonial, and Foreign Missions of the Church."

I.—We must consider first the difficulties and dangers in our path, and we must vary our methods accordingly, without stepping outside the true limits of Catholic belief and Apostolic order.

(a) There is the great difficulty arising from the sectarianism of English Christians. If Home reunion, conducted on the sound basis laid down by the Lambeth Conference in 1888, cannot at present lead us to any definite hopes of corporate unity, we may hope that the courtesies engendered by mutual conference may result in a policy of truce in the presence of the heathen. I do not mean by this a policy of undenominationalism, for if a stranger is to judge from recent controversies in the London School Board, Christianity and undenominationalism are two distinct religions.

But the over-lapping of different Missions can be avoided by mutual arrangement, and the difficulty avoided of confusing the heathen with conflicting aspects of Christianity. It is desirable to avoid giving a shrewd pagan the opportunity of suggesting to Christian missionaries that they had better come to an agreement amongst themselves as to what Christianity *really is* before they attempt to convert the heathen. Our Lord prayed for His disciples "that they all may be one: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (S. John xvii. 21). The scattered and divided forces of a sectarian Poly-churchism will never defeat the legion powers of heathenism. The unity of the Catholic Church can alone convert the world. Meanwhile, we must minimise the evils of disunion in the face of the enemy by brotherly kindness, tact, sympathy, and a frank readiness to acknowledge the self-denying labours of missionaries who do not belong to our Communion.

(b) Then there is the kindred difficulty of disjointed and disunited effort amongst ourselves. It is a calamity that the Church of England cannot act corporately through a Board of Missions, as the American Church does. The ancient and venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel comes nearest to this ideal, by the breadth and Churchliness of its methods. But it cannot, on its present

lines, represent the Mission work of the Church in its corporate capacity. The organisation of the Church Missionary Society is admirable, but the Missions of the Church of England, as a whole, could never be directed by a committee sitting in Salisbury Square, however able the members of that committee might be. And then there are the ever-increasing number of little missionary societies, with their special funds for special objects. There is no doubt a good side to these special funds, because they create definite interest in certain favoured parts of the Mission field. But on the other hand they cause a terrible waste of energy, time, and money. Each fund has its separate organisation, which involves separate secretaries, with their postal and office expenses, and, what is even worse, a kind of competition and rivalry in obtaining offertories and support, which constitutes a distinct weakness to the missionary cause. I am given to understand that efforts are being made at the present time to lessen the evils I have mentioned. I feel certain that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is ready to reconsider its line of action with regard to these special funds, and the only solution of the question which is within the range of practical politics is that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel should administer these funds on certain conditions, one of which most certainly ought to be, that

in a colonial Diocese, whose finances are locally administered by a Diocesan Board of Finance, legally elected by the Diocesan Synod, all funds raised or contributed in England should be administered by the Diocesan Finance Board, and in no other way.

There is another danger connected with the undue multiplication of these special funds. They encourage a tendency towards "diocesan congregationalism." The phrase is not mine. An eminent layman in South Africa used it in my presence to express that dangerous weakening of provincial cohesion and authority which inevitably results from the undue independence of single Dioceses. The union of the separate diocesan associations connected with South Africa, in a common South African festival, is a distinct step in the right direction, so far as the South African Church is concerned.

(c) It seems hardly needful to point out the danger of neglecting the careful and sympathetic study of the truths enshrined in Mahometanism, Buddhism, and other religious systems which have influenced great masses of mankind. Modern missionaries are not likely to forget the necessity of a careful comparison of religions, and the further fact that wherever we can discover any root truths of religious ethics or dogma it is our bounden duty to disencumber them from surrounding falsehoods and utilise them to the full.

One secret of missionary success is to put ourselves, so far as we can, in the place of those we wish to teach, and to remember the vast difference between our Western modes of thought, and Anglo-Saxon type of character, and the mental habits and characteristics of the people we are striving to win to Christ.

The missionary must be Catholic, with the width of sympathy which belongs to the messenger of the world-embracing city of God, and he must be "all things to all men," with the Christ-like tact and sympathy of S. Paul.

We must not forget that the whole world cannot be made Anglican. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 struck a true Catholic note on this point. We regard the Lambeth Conference as being morally, if not legally, a general Synod of the Churches of our Communion, and it manifests in its decisions the "consentient witness" of Anglican Christendom. The Anglican Communion is the purest representative of the primitive Christianity, of the great councils and creeds of the Catholic Church. But it possesses other non-essential characteristics, which are the legacies of past controversies, or the local colouring imparted by the special mental type of the Anglo-Saxon race. The Lambeth Conference gives missionaries a warning lest they should impose upon native Churches these non-essential characteristics of Anglicanism.

The Encyclical Letter of 1888 says that "a certain liberty of treatment must be extended to the case of native and growing Churches on which it would be unreasonable to impose, as conditions of communion, the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles, coloured as they are in language and form by the peculiar circumstances under which they were originally drawn up." The essentials of the faith, discipline, and order of the Catholic Church can be maintained amongst native Christians without imposing non-essentials, which may be foreign to their temperament, however useful they may be to our own race and people.

Another point to be remembered is, that the missionary should carefully examine, from a native point of view, such manifestations of natural virtue and manliness as may be found to exist in the native character, and endeavour to build up a native type of Christianity. God has not left Himself without witness amongst the heathen, and we must take pains to recognise that witness wherever it may be manifested. It has been found necessary in South Africa to break down the power of the native chiefs, and to put an end to tribal allegiance. The same process was attempted in Ireland, under Elizabeth, and in Scotland, after the rising of the Clans in 1745. But the true missionary can recognise an element of nobility in a voluntary fealty of blind obedience

to the cruel despotism of a South African chief. The Kafir and Zulu can be taught to transfer this unquestioning allegiance from an earthly chief to a Heavenly King. I am here merely employing an illustration drawn from the country where I work. The experience of other men in dealing with other races will prove that the same principle is capable of an extended and universal application.

It is, also, most important not to keep our converts in a state of perpetual tutelage. The plan of founding Mission stations, and allowing villages of native Christians to be formed round the missionary's headquarters, has been tried for nearly one hundred years in South Africa, and has resulted in the failure predicted by the keen insight of Bishop Gray, more than forty years ago. It is far better to avoid artificial restraints, and to allow the natives their due share and responsibility in Church matters. The native Clergy have fully justified their position in our South African Diocesan Synods. Our Kafir congregations are all the better for electing their own Churchwardens and Sidesmen at the Easter Vestries, and for the obligation laid upon them to raise money in support of their own Clergy and schools. What we have found useful and practicable in South Africa may be found useful elsewhere.

II.—We have now to consider the best method of organising and working our Missions.

We must look for guidance to the principles of the early Church. We shall find that, as a rule, Missions were headed by a Bishop, and it is not necessary for me to vindicate a principle hallowed amongst us by the martyr-deaths of Mackenzie, Patteson, and Hannington. We may marvel at the opposition to this obvious axiom of Church order which was displayed when Bishop Gray boldly swept away the Erastian sophistries of Crown lawyers by consecrating Bishop Mackenzie in Capetown Cathedral as our first Missionary Bishop in 1861.

English Churchmen have now outgrown the idea that a Bishop is a great State dignitary, with a palace and a seat in the House of Lords. They have learnt to reverence a Bishop as a Father in God, and to realise that the true and inherent dignity of his Apostolic throne is more venerable than that of any earthly throne or kingdom, and therefore needs no temporal rank or secular privileges to magnify it before the eyes of men. Thirty years ago this was not the case, and we may be thankful that the unity and solidarity of our Episcopate has found due recognition.

Acting on this true principle, the Bishop of Korea has been consecrated and sent forth to face the manifold dangers of a heathen land. In a month's time the South African Church will consecrate Edmund Smyth to our newly-formed Missionary Diocese of

Lebombo, where, from the nucleus of civilisation formed by Barberton and the Northern Transvaal, he will set forth to organise Missions in Gazaland, and amongst the tribes round Delagoa Bay, which have, as yet, been absolutely untouched by Christianity.

We must now consider the organisation of a Missionary Diocese:—

The practice of sending out Missionary Bishops on a basis virtually autocephalous is a weakness to be avoided when possible. The union of the Missionary Diocese of Melanesia with the Church of New Zealand has stirred colonists to take their part in missionary work. The laity who sat in the South African Provincial Synod of 1891 will feel their responsibility for the new Missionary Dioceses of Mashonaland and Lebombo, which were founded by the House of Bishops during its session. And besides the good effected by causing colonial Churchmen to feel their missionary responsibility, the Missionary Bishops and their Clergy escape the evils of isolation by taking their share and part in the Synods of a Province of the Catholic Church.

A mighty impulse will be given to our Missions when Anglican Christendom attains its legitimate development of organisation. Archbishops will preside over the colonial Churches owning allegiance to the Patriarch of Canterbury. The Lambeth Conference will become a general Synod of the Churches of

our Communion. A central spiritual Tribunal of Appeal will bind us together, and we shall stand in serried order to confront and attack the myriad forces of heathenism and unbelief, and be able to plead as we have never pleaded before, with the ancient Churches of the East and the West, and with our brethren who are severed from the Historic Episcopate, to pardon our mistakes in the past, and our shortcomings in the present, to remember our central position as a rallying point for the disunited forces of Christendom ; and to come over and help us to carry the everlasting Gospel of our King *to the heathen who have not known Him, and to the nations who have not called upon His name* (Ps. lxxix. 6).

Then we must consider the question of the staff of a Missionary Diocese. It is needless to discuss the vexed question of celibacy or marriage for missionaries. In a settled missionary district, where pastoral work has to be built up amongst a considerable nucleus of professing Christians, the missionary's wife can do just as valuable work as the wife of an English parochial clergyman. But it is a hard lot for any cultivated woman to face. We need the work of cultivated women in the Mission field, to raise the tone of native women and girls, and this kind of work is better done if freshness of zeal is brought to bear upon it. A woman may keep up to the mark for a few years with the consciousness that she can retire

from the work if her vigour and energy leaves her. But the missionary's wife cannot retire very well unless she takes her husband with her, and instances are known of able missionaries who have felt compelled by the claims of a wife and family to quit the Mission field.

I am quite certain in my own mind that, so far as South Africa is concerned, community life, based upon the life vows of mediæval monasticism, is impracticable in our Mission field. I believe that Clergy who decide to remain unmarried so long as they are engaged in direct missionary work, do the best work. Missionaries, and especially young missionaries, ought not to be isolated. Our Lord sent forth His disciples "two and two" to do their work. We can follow the guidance of Divine wisdom, and we can send two unmarried Clergy to live together in some missionary outpost at a less cost than a married missionary's stipend.

There is great need of the services of laymen in some parts of the Mission field, as catechists, school-masters, and artisans, to superintend industrial work. The technical education of natives ought not to form part of the daily cares of the missionary Priest. It will, sooner or later, interfere with his spiritual work ; and a practical, earnest, and devoted layman will manage this side of native education much better than the missionary himself. Laymen are wanted for

missionary work who are contented to remain laymen, and who do not look upon a year or two at a Mission centre as sufficient preparation for Holy Orders. We cannot possibly sanction the idea that missionaries can be permitted to fall below the rest of the Clergy in their standard of theological attainments. Our very best missionaries in South Africa have been University men of some power and culture, and there is no truth more certainly proved by experience than the fact that an inferior man may do very well in England, where he is helped by venerable traditions and surroundings, whereas in a colony, or in the Mission field, he would be helpless and useless.

It is for this reason that the South African Bishops maintain such a high standard for candidates for Holy Orders. It would be absolutely fatal if inferior men in England thought that the Examining Chaplains of a South African Bishop were likely to deal with them more leniently than the Examining Chaplains of an English Bishop. It is a vital necessity for the Colonial Church in its missionary aspect to maintain a high, and even a severe, standard for candidates for Holy Orders. A native ministry is absolutely necessary. There are many native Clergy of great ability in our Missionary Dioceses, and it would never be wise for any of the European Clergy to fall below the intellectual level of the native Clergy.

The training and discipline of a native ministry is

one of the most onerous and responsible tasks of a Missionary Bishop. Quite apart from the fact that a sound native type of Christianity cannot be produced permanently by missionaries of another race, it is impossible for the European missionary to get to the bottom of the native mind and its habit of thought without the aid of a native ministry. The native Clergy should be treated with deference and respect by their European colleagues, in order that the natives may learn to respect them, and the standard of examination for Holy Orders should, under no circumstance, be relaxed for natives, although its requirements may differ in detail from those of European candidates. It is better, for instance, for a native to have an accurate knowledge of English than a smattering of Latin or Greek, and I have known a native who could thoroughly appreciate Canon Liddon's Bampton Lectures to be much perplexed with Butler's Analogy. The South African Bishops have adopted a common standard and syllabus for candidates for Holy Orders, which is in use in the ten Dioceses of the Province, and special subjects are set down for the natives without lowering the standard as a whole.

III.—I must conclude with a few words on the duty of Christian governments towards the native races. Broadly speaking, the Government ought to maintain a carefully guarded neutrality towards the spiritual

work of the missionary, and the missionary, on his part, ought to support law and order without trenching upon the domain of politics. The miserable policy of the Indian Government in former days tended to a timorous and craven discouragement of Christianity. Better days have dawned, and a better time may still be hoped for when the Indian Church has been freed from the unnatural fetters of Letters Patent, and the irritating circumstances of a species of State control, which involves all the disabilities of an Established Church without any of its advantages. A vexed question like the opium traffic must not be left in the hands of a few zealous enthusiasts who press for hasty legislation. It needs the best thoughts of a great and lofty-minded statesman, who will deal with its complicated issues in a broad and statesman-like way.

The same treatment is necessary for dealing successfully with the native liquor traffic. The restrictions upon this traffic agreed to by the Brussels African Conference, and ratified by the seventeen governments and states represented at it, will do untold good if properly enforced. Total prohibition is the one sound policy, and when this is impracticable, a heavy duty on spirits should be imposed.

Our South African natives know their national weakness, and have petitioned Government to adopt a policy of total prohibition. In Bechuanaland, and

in the territories ruled directly by Mr. Rhodes as managing director of the Chartered Company, this policy has been enforced with the best possible results. If Lo Bengula and his Matabeles are permitted to harass and interrupt the civilising operations of the Chartered Company in Mashonaland, it will mean that the country will be opened again to the drink traffic from the Portuguese territories, as well as in other directions, and also the destruction of the unfortunate Mashonas.

The civil Government can also be fairly called upon to suppress heathen customs that are dangerous to public peace and social order. The abolition of suttee, and the discouragement of child marriages in India, has been paralleled by the bold action of the Cape Government in suppressing immoral and indecent heathen rites, and in discouraging polygamy. No native marriages are recognised as legal except they have been solemnised by a minister of religion or before a magistrate.

The Provincial Missionary Conference of the South African Church, in its session last year, passed resolutions thanking the Government in its action in these matters. Polygamy is the chief hindrance to Christian Missions in South Africa. There are numbers of natives who understand the claims of the Christian religion, and deliberately reject it on account of the Christian law of marriage. It is on

this account that we are so thankful that the Cape Government recognises the fact that polygamy is a danger to the State, and that it will have to be dealt with as the American Government has dealt with the Mormons. As a rule, South African colonists, of English and Dutch descent, treat the natives well. An isolated case of ill-treatment is so rare and exceptional that it proves the rule. But the native vote is a power in South African politics, and a decent-living colonist naturally objects to a native polygamist living in heathenism exercising the parliamentary franchise on a political level with himself. If the Cape Parliament would pass an Act to deprive polygamists of the franchise a heavy blow would be struck at this terrible evil.

It is the duty of all Governments to educate the people. The education of the natives in South Africa is practically in the hands of the missionaries, and the Government gives efficient support to the Mission schools without attempting to introduce undenominationalism. I have had no experience of a country where the natives are not increasing and prospering under our rule. The duty of Government towards Australian aborigines is to preserve a perishing remnant. The duty of South African Governments is to guide and train a rising and prosperous people. It is far easier for the Church to influence the Government and make her indepen-

dent witness a power in the land where she is free from all legal connection with the State. The freedom of the Church is absolutely essential to the discharge of her missionary work in a new country. I speak from experience, and from a confessed inability to enter into the complex questions which beset the Church in England.

I am bound to say what I feel to be true, and, in closing this paper, I have but to add that I have purposely omitted all reference to the inner and spiritual side of the work of a missionary. In some respects, his work is easier than that of a busy town parish priest in England. In some points, it presents more difficulties. *There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit.* The grace given "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God" works as powerfully in the one case as in the other. To that grace, and to the prayers of the faithful for the coming of the Kingdom of our God, we may commit our missionary work in the light of the abiding presence of our King in His Church.

BX Wirgman, Augustus Theodore, 1846-1917.
5133 The spirit of liberty : and other sermon
W585 addresses / by A. Theodore Wirgman. -- Lon
S6 Bemrose, 1893.
xi, 166p. ; 20cm.
9 sermons.
1. Church of England--Sermons. I. Title

A 272014

CCSC/mmb

